

AMERICA

A·CATHOLIC·REVIEW·OF·THE·WEEK

VOL. XX. No. 9 }
WHOLE No. 503 }

DECEMBER 7, 1918

{ PRICE, 10 CENTS
\$3.00 A YEAR

Chronicle

The War.—During the greater part of the week the Allied armies of occupation were practically at a standstill, preparing for their advance into German territory.

Military Movements. According to an announcement of the Nov. 25, p.m.-Dec. 1, a.m. French War Office, Marshal Pétain, accompanied by General de Castelnau,

made his solemn entry into Strassburg at the head of the troops of General Gouraud. The French were received with the greatest enthusiasm. On December 1 the American troops crossed the frontier into Prussia and occupied Treves. British forces under General Plumer also advanced into German territory between Beho and Eupen and reached the line of Hurg, Reuland, Ballingen and Montjoie. A Reuter's dispatch of November 30 from Budapest by way of Berlin reports that the Hungarian Government decided to intern the whole of Field Marshal von Mackensen's army of 170,000 men in accordance with the demands of the French Government. Ever since his conquest of Rumania in November, 1916, von Mackensen has needed a large force to keep the country in subjection. When it became evident that Germany must soon surrender, von Mackensen tried to withdraw his army. The move, however, was blocked by the Hungarians who had yielded to Italy before the armistice with Germany was signed. The armistice with Italy stipulated that Austro-Hungarian territory should not be used for the movement of German military forces. Field Marshal von Mackensen ranked next to the First Quartermaster General von Ludendorff and Field Marshal von Hindenburg in military fame in Germany. He enjoyed the reputation of being one of the sternest of German generals in the discipline of his own men and towards the enemy.

What was considered on all sides the most striking Thanksgiving Day service in Paris was that organized by the Knights of Columbus and held at the Church of the Madeleine. The eminent ecclesiastics present included Cardinal Bourne, Archbishop of Westminster, Cardinal

Thanksgiving Day in Paris
Amette, Archbishop of Paris, Cardinal Luçon, Archbishop of Reims, the Bishops of Amiens, Beauvais, Châlons and Soissons. Admiral William S. Benson represented the United States. Edward M. Hurley, Chair-

man of the American Shipping Board, was also present, as well as Colonel Workman, head of the Catholic Mission to the Canadian forces. In voicing Great Britain's gratitude to the United States, Cardinal Bourne said: "American intervention was wholly spiritual. It was nothing sordid. No appetite for conquest determined it. America has contributed to save the world. Let us thank God for having chosen America as the instrument of His Divine power." Cardinal Amette added an expression of France's gratitude to the United States. After the *Te Deum* the clergy proceeded to the steps surrounding the church, where Cardinal Amette blessed the immense throngs. It was estimated that 20,000 persons kneeling in the mud, despite the cold and the rain, received the blessing.

It was officially announced at the executive offices in Washington on November 29 that the representatives of the United States at the Peace Conference would be:

The Makeup of the Peace Delegation
The President himself, the Secretary of State, the Hon. Henry White, recently Ambassador to France, Mr. Edward M. House and General Tasker H. Bliss. The President goes to the Conference as a full-fledged delegate. When the President leaves France, after what is now supposed to be a period of from six to eight weeks, his place on the American Peace Commission will be taken by Mr. Baker, the Secretary of War. General Tasker H. Bliss is a member of the Supreme War Council at Versailles. Mr. Henry White, though formerly prominent in diplomatic life has for some time been almost forgotten. He was born in Baltimore in 1850. He is a Republican, although not very active in party affairs. He began his diplomatic career in 1883, when he was appointed Secretary to the American Legation at Vienna. He was Ambassador to Italy from 1905 to 1907, Ambassador to France from 1907 to 1909, and American delegate to the Algeiras Conference on the Moroccan question in 1906. He was entrusted with important diplomatic duties in South America. According to the plan announced from Washington, the President intends to sail on the George Washington from New York and is to land most probably at Brest in France.

In his eagerly-expected address to Congress on De-

cember 2 President Wilson declared that it was international justice that was sought by the United States

*The President's
Congress Address*

and not merely domestic safety. He stated that the principles enunciated by him as a basis of peace, having been accepted by the nations, he owed it to them that no false or mistaken interpretation be placed upon them. For this alone was he going abroad. He called upon Congress for the added strength of their united support, and promised that he would be at all times in complete counsel with the leaders by wireless and cable.

By far the greater part of the address was devoted to the discussion of the domestic problems of the country. Of its more than 5,000 words only 750 were taken up with the trip to France. Among the domestic problems discussed the most important at the present moment is that of the railroads. The President clearly intimated that the railroads would be returned to private ownership, but not without some future regulation by the Government of a rather comprehensive nature. He further advocated woman suffrage, the ratification of the Colombian treaty and determination of taxes for 1918, 1919 and 1920.

In the Senate of the United States, December 2, Senator Cummins of Iowa introduced a resolution to send a special Senate committee to Paris. In introducing the resolution the Senator declared that the Senate must take independent steps to keep itself informed on the peace negotiations, since the President failed to name one of its members on the peace commission. The committee, made up of four Republicans and four Democrats, would be charged with the duty of "inquiring diligently" into all facts connected with the peace negotiations and reporting them to the Senate.

Australia.—The recent erection of new bishoprics and the observance of Religious Congregations' golden jubilees are signs of the Church's steady growth in Australia.

Catholic Progress The Rt. Rev. William Hayden, the first Bishop of the enlarged diocese of Wilcannia-Forbes, was enthroned October 27, in the Cathedral at Broken Hill, and the diocese of Wagga, with Bishop Dwyer as its first shepherd, was established October 13. The bishopric embraces some of the most important districts in New South Wales. The Dominican Sisters lately celebrated their Golden Jubilee. Fifty years ago seven religious came to Australia from Ireland, being the first Sisters to reach the colony. The Christian Brothers will also celebrate their Golden Jubilee. Three Brothers opened their first school at Melbourne early in 1869. There are now thirty-six communities in Australasia conducting some fifty schools attended by 50,000 children. The Sisters of Charity observed the twenty-fifth birthday of St. Vincent's Hospital, Melbourne, in October, and early in the same month the Apostolic Delegate and the Australian Hierarchy assisted at the solemn dedication of Our Lady of Victories

Church at Camberwell, a national shrine of the Blessed Virgin.

On November 17 the Australian Senate passed a resolution that it is essential to the future welfare of Australia that the captured German possessions in the Pacific now occupied by Australian and New Zealand troops should not be restored to Germany, and that Australia should

Claims and Taxes

be consulted regarding any proposals affecting these islands. The Treasurer of the Australian Government announces that the country is ready to sell 1,000,000,000 tons of wheat at a minimum price of \$1.14 a bushel, provided that Australia is permitted to compete in the wheat markets and is able to reserve the rest of the wheat supply on hand. The new Federal Budget proposes increased taxation amounting to £5,356,000, thus distributed: Customs and excise imposts on spirits and tobacco, £1,985,000; income tax, £2,200,000; land tax, £380,000; entertainment tax, £275,000; extra postage, £516,000. Commenting on the budget, the Melbourne *Tribune* remarks:

In round figures, the cost of governing Australia, with a population of less than 5,000,000, has increased during eighteen years by nearly £50,000,000. This, of course, is quite outside the war cost, which now stands at between £80,000,000 and £90,000,000 a year. In the face of these facts, what is the Government doing to prevent the country drifting into a state of insolvency? Nothing, and worse than nothing, for we find them, at the present moment indulging in the same lavish expenditure of pre-war times, building up new departments and creating new staffs, while heaping up the burden of taxation on the productive industries of the people. This state of things cannot go on; it will, no doubt, be borne with while the war lasts, but there must come an end to it. . . . The chief means of grappling with post-war financial problems, however, will be found in Governmental economy and all it stands for. The people of Australia must realize how utterly disproportionate it is to have a comparative handful of people—less than 5,000,000—ruled over by seven Governors and seven Agents-General—each provided with ambassadorial residences and staffs at the seat of the Empire. What a field of operation we have here and in other directions for a judicious use of the pruning-knife. Unification may not be desirable, but retrenchment is absolutely necessary.

The *Tribune* fears that the labor problems to be solved in Australia when the soldiers come back will be too difficult for the Government to settle.

Germany.—The doubt as to the reported abdication of the German Emperor has finally led to a formal act of renunciation which took place on November 28. "In

*Text of Kaiser's
Abdication*

order to reply to certain misunderstandings which have arisen with regard to the abdication," says the new German Government, the following document has been issued, signed with the single name "William":

By the present document I renounce forever my rights to the crown of Prussia and the rights to the German imperial crown. I release at the same time all the officials of the German Empire and Prussia, and also all officers, noncommissioned officers and soldiers of the Prussian navy and army and of contingents from confederate States from the oath of fidelity which they have taken to me.

As their Emperor, King and Supreme Chief, I expect from them, until a new organization of the German Empire exists, that they will aid those who effectively hold the power in Germany to protect the German people against the menacing dangers of anarchy, famine and foreign domination.

Made and executed and signed by our own hand with the imperial seal at Amerongen, November 28.

A dispatch to the Wolff Bureau states that the ex-Kaiser's abdication decree expressed the hope that "the new regent" would be able to protect the German people against anarchy, starvation and foreign supremacy. The former Empress has now joined her husband at Amerongen.

The establishment of a neutral commission to examine the question as to the responsibility for the war was proposed in a note sent to Switzerland for transmission to

Commission to Decide War Blame

France, Great Britain, Italy and the United States. It asks that all belligerents place their secret documents at the disposal of the commission. Replying to the charges of the Bavarian Premier, that the Government at Berlin was responsible for the war, Dr. Alfred Zimmermann, former Secretary of Foreign Affairs, said in the *Deutsche Zeitung*:

We did in fact consider that, with the crime of Serajevo, Austria-Hungary's hour of destiny had struck. We did not prompt Austria-Hungary to her action, but expressly advised her against it. The Vienna ultimatum, which we considered too severe, was communicated to us too late to endeavor to mitigate it.

According to the Berlin *Tageblatt* the Soldiers' and Workmen's Council has ordered the seizure of all documents relating to foreign affairs and the old governmental system of Germany. It has also demanded the speedy retirement of Dr. W. S. Solf, the Foreign Secretary.

It is still quite impossible to predict what turn events may take in Germany. It is not likely that either the majority or the minority group of Socialists, who have seized the governmental power represent the great body of the people.

Political Conditions in Germany

A recent ballot has shown that the violent minority element, headed by leaders like Liebknecht, is numerically very small. The larger and more moderate Socialist group, under Chancellor Ebert and Herr Haase, are not however able to control these extremists who recently took over the wireless stations in Germany and are using them for their own propaganda purposes. In the meantime a new "German Democratic party" has been formed on the initiative of Herr Wolff, editor of the Berlin *Tageblatt*. He thus outlines its policy:

Our party has been formed to support the republic, to further democratic reforms on a socialistic-economic basis, and to furnish a rallying point for the middle classes and keep them from falling into the power of the reactionaries. The party will naturally oppose Bolshevism with all means at its command. In other words, we aim to win and hold the middle classes for democracy.

Herr Wolff claims that his party is by far the strongest

next to the Socialists. It proposes the socialization of certain industries, such as mines, and will demand that great estates be divided up for settlement by returning soldiers. It maintains, however, that private property may not be touched without full compensation. No men who have been active in militaristic or nationalistic agitation, or who favored the annexation policy or the submarine campaign are eligible for leadership. Among its members is Dr. Hugo Preuss, who at present is drafting a constitution for submission at the National Assembly. February 16 has been set by the Council of the People's Commissioners as the date for the elections to this Constituent Assembly, on condition that it meets with the approval of the Soldiers' and Workmen's Congress, which meets December 16. The Empire, it is said, will be divided into thirty-eight electoral districts, to which from six to sixteen seats each will be allotted, according to the population. The territory of the Empire, as it existed before the war, will be taken as the basis of the division.

Bavaria has broken relations with the Berlin Government. The latest explanation given by the Bavarian Premier is to the effect that the German Foreign Office

The Bavarian Premier

at Berlin has become the center of a counter-revolution movement. "If Bavaria is forced to act independently the whole of south Germany will support us," he stated. "Prussian militarism and anarchy mean the same thing to us," declares a proclamation issued by the Liberal party in Baden, demanding complete separation from Berlin. There is strong opposition throughout Germany against the Socialist Premier of Bavaria, Kurt Eisner, who has imposed himself upon the people. Even Bavarian radical elements are strongly criticising him, and the Jewess, Rachel Rabinowitz, thus writes of him in the *Bavarian Courier*:

Eisner is neither a German nor a Bavarian, but a Jew and a foreigner. It is a thoroughly sound feeling which makes the Bavarians object to being ruled by a foreigner. We Jews would object greatly if compelled to accept a non-Jewish head for a Jewish congregation.

All the newspapers, except the extremist left, seem to agree that he has created an intolerable situation. Bavarian Catholics, who form the bulk of the population, are said to be opposing him.

Great Britain.—From such dispatches as have found their way to this country, it seems that while the proposed "League of Nations" is engrossing much of the public's attention, no definite constitution for

The League of Nations and the Freedom of the Seas

one. Speaking in London at the Thanksgiving Day banquet of the American Society, Sir Robert L. Borden, the Canadian Premier, hinted that a league between the United States and Great Britain alone would be strong enough to insure the peace of the world.

Let us have a League of Nations, if it can be realized, but at least let us have that understanding and unity of purpose and

action between the two world-wide English-speaking commonwealths which will save humanity in years to come from the unbearable horror, suffering, and sacrifice of a war like this. United by ties of race, language, literature and tradition, the nations of the Britannic Commonwealth and the States composing the great American Republic, can command the peace of the world. . . . Let no minor consideration, no petty rivalry, no unworthy distrust, divide those who, united, can command the world's abiding peace.

In connection with the League, one of the problems uppermost in the British mind is the attitude which would be assumed toward the "freedom of the seas." Here again there is room for much diversity of opinion. Possibly Lord Beresford represents the extremest outpost of English thought on this vexed topic. A United Press cablegram represents him as saying:

The British fleet insured the victory. The League of Nations is no counterpoise to the command of the seas by the British fleet. The British Empire will never consent to give up command of the seas, but it would gladly welcome the assistance of English-speaking nations to retain that command.

This proposition is as clear as it is cool, and quite unacceptable both to the United States and to France. On the other hand, General F. B. Maurice, at one time Director of Operations, admits that in view of the difficulties surrounding the question, "no Government would be willing to bind itself indefinitely." Colonel Repington, the military critic, probably mirrors the attitude of the average man when he says, "I have not the slightest idea what freedom of the seas means, nor have I met anyone who can tell me."

Mexico.—That Mexico is, and has been, in a most wretched condition is known to all who are not blinded by prejudice. But a new and interesting bit of evidence is had in the subjoined letter written

Internal Affairs by Congressman Robles Dominguez to Carranza:

Honored Sir:

Nearly two years have elapsed since, in an open letter, I took the liberty of calling your attention to the fatal consequences the Government's financial acts would bring about. A little more than one year ago, driven to it by the attacks of a newspaper of this Capital, I was forced to defend my opinions regarding the error which the preconstitutional Government had committed when it launched forth a new *Magna Charta*, without observing legal procedure and constitutional law, wandering away from the Plan of Guadalupe which you had fought for and the triumph of which you had obtained with as much constancy as energy.

My predictions, unfortunately, have come true; the mischief has far surpassed anything that was then foreseen. We are now faced with the fact that the Government is weakened by an overpowering loss of prestige, is without money wherewith to meet the enormous expenses which the Administration has to face, especially in the war department, with neither arms or ammunition (I am quoting the latest presidential report) to fight the insurrection with which the country is aflame, an insurrection which it is no longer possible to quell, not merely because of the greatly increased number of those who are in arms, but also because these men are heartened by the discontent of the great majority of the population of the republic, which loudly lays upon the Government the blame for the bankruptcy and

the destitution in which we are plunged, and for the endless calamities that are wearing away our lives.

Furthermore, the Government has been powerless to put down the aforesaid insurrection, which is increasing from day to day instead of diminishing. It is imperative, therefore, to make use of other means than the force of arms to restore public order. We must likewise be looking into the future for the fate of our nation when peace is made in Europe.

It becomes necessary that you should gage the situation by direct acquaintance with the symptoms. Everything points to the belief that the accumulation of hate and despair resulting from the economic situation will bring about an upheaval which will do away with existing conditions. Even in the Government army there are many anxiously wondering what their fate will be when the day the crash, which appears inevitable, arrives.

Knowing, as I do, your aversion to certain public manifestations, I would have written to you privately, but I fear my letter would go into the waste basket or to the files, I desire at the same time to go on record to prove that our nation has not reached such a state of degeneracy that it lacks a son to raise his voice, in these moments of anguish and vital anxiety, regardless of the false interpretations of such action or of the consequences his action may bring upon him.

It is not sufficient to pour out recriminations and lamentations; it is our duty to act rapidly and energetically to remedy the evil which is killing us. With this end in view, I am ready, together with many others, to work with the elements now struggling for the purpose of finding, or at least preparing, a solution of the many and complicated internal and external problems that beset our country.

With the request for guarantees for the carrying out of this work, which we consider honest and patriotic, I turn to you, whom it would undoubtedly distress to be the last among Mexicans in displaying good-will, honesty and patriotism.

I end with the hope that you will lay aside all prejudice and influences, all the notions by which you are obsessed and which are liable to distort your judgment; and that together, with all the Mexican people, whose misfortunes I echo, you will do us the favor of granting an answer to this letter.

Evidences from other sources fully confirm the Congressman's statements.

Russia.—The dictatorship set up at Omsk by Admiral Kolchak does not seem to have promoted harmony in Siberia. The Ofa Government refuses to recognize the

Chaotic Siberia new Dictator and the Czech troops, who are hard pressed by the Bolsheviki, are at a loss what attitude to

adopt toward the "All-Russia" officers who are supporting Kolchak. They are depressed by the Allies' failure to send them help, and General Syrov, the acting Commander-in-Chief of the Czech army, says that "without direct military aid from the Allies order cannot be established in Russia." He continued:

The change of Government has killed our soldiers. They say that for four years they have been fighting for democracy, and that now that a dictator rules in Omsk they are no longer fighting for democracy. Since the armistice all the soldiers want to go home to fight the Germans and Magyars in their own country and not fight the Russians. If the change of government had been lawful and if it had not been caused by troops, which should have been at the front fighting instead of being in Omsk causing trouble, then the effect would have been good.

The fighting going on at Ekaterinburg between the Czechs and the Bolsheviki is reported to be quite ruthless.

The King, the Cardinal and the Marshal

GEORGE BARTON

WHO won the war? It is a big question, and it requires a careful answer. Belgium won the war for if she had not resisted the German invasion the Germans would have swept through that country and overpowered France and England by mere force of numbers. France won the war for if it had not been for the persistence and courage of the brave French army the Prussian hordes would have gone unchecked to the English channel. Great Britain won the war for the blocking of the German fleet, the capture of the Turkish army, and the dogged determination of the English soldiers were enormous factors in the final result. Russia won the war for the early mobilization of her troops caused Germany to send countless thousands of her soldiers to the Eastern front, and thereby weakened her to that extent in France. Italy won the war for her overwhelming defeat of the Austrians first caused that nation to sue for peace. The United States won the war for her unprecedented feat in sending millions of men across the trackless Atlantic turned the balance in favor of the Allies, and thus insured the downfall of the most autocratic Power in the world. In short, we all won the war, and in the face of the sacrifices that have been made, and the glorious victory that has been achieved comparisons are not only unnecessary but odious.

But in every great crisis in the history of the world heroic figures stand out above their fellows with the distinctness and the picturesqueness of the lighthouses that dot the rocky coasts of the seven seas. Amid the din and clamor, the chaos and smoke of battle we behold a tall, well-built man whose steel helmet glistens in the sunlight, and we know instinctively that it is Albert, King of the Belgians, the knightliest figure of them all, the man who was willing to sacrifice life and all the agreeable things of earthly existence rather than submit to the loss of his honor. Mark him well, for he is the type of true manliness. The strong jaw, the frank and boyish eyes, the broad forehead, and the unaffected simplicity justify the admiration that is felt for him by honest men everywhere. His position was inherited, and before the war he was quoted as saying to a visitor: "I wish I could have won my throne." Who shall say that his laudable desire has not been fully gratified, for if there is a ruler anywhere today who has earned his scepter, it is the heroic king of the Belgians.

Where is the pen that can do justice to the part played by the Belgian people during the first three months of the war, under the leadership of this splendid specimen of manhood? We know, and all the world knows, how they frustrated the complete triumph upon which the Prussians so confidently counted. The defense of Liège and Namur alone entitles the Belgian soldiers to a place

among the bravest of the brave. It was their self-imposed task to hold the north of Belgium until the French and English came to their aid. The help they longed for did not reach them, but in spite of that they accomplished the almost impossible task. In the initial encounter they met with dreadful losses, but in that conflict no less than 3,000 Germans were among the killed. In one instance a single Belgian regiment arrested the progress of an entire German army corps. The heroic defenders of their soil lost half of their men in that engagement, and two-thirds of their officers. They were pressed back, inch by inch, until they had but a fragment of their beloved country to call their own. At that supreme moment, massed in the last corner of Belgium, King Albert issued the famous order: "Resist to the end! Hold on to the death!" And that order was literally obeyed. For months and years they suffered and starved and died. But it was not in vain. Only a few days ago King Albert, at the head of his victorious troops, marched into the capital of Belgium, amid the tears and the cheers of his long-suffering people.

Once again we turn and gaze on stricken Belgium, and this time we see a venerable man in red, tall, thin and straight as an arrow, a man with the simplicity and strength that go with greatness, a man whose very face carries on it the evidence of goodness and power. Need it be said that this is Cardinal Mercier, whose defiance of the Germans furnishes the material out of which must come one of the most thrilling stories of the great world war? The insolent power of the invaders had no terror for this man, because to him right was always greater than might. Made a captive in his palace he sent forth those wonderful pastoral letters which cheered and strengthened the Belgian people in the darkest hour of their tribulation. Threatened by the arrogant and insolent von Bissing he hurled forth a defiance that rang around the world; menaced by the intimation of a German dungeon he dared his tormentors to do their worst. But it was in protecting his people that Cardinal Mercier was at his best. Nothing could induce him to concede to the invaders the moral right to do a wrong. Like his famous French predecessor he rose to supreme heights in defying kings and kaisers. He points to poor bleeding Belgium, and in the famous words of the poet cries: "Around her form I draw the awful circle of our solemn Church. Step but a foot within that holy ground, and on thy head, yea, though it wore a crown, I launch the curse of Rome!"

Some day the complete story of Cardinal Mercier will be told and when it is we shall find a narrative that will excel in interest the greatest romances of history. He was more dangerous to the German cause than an arm.

division or a fleet of battleships. The Germans would have shot him if they had dared, but they did not dare. They tried to bribe him into silence, they endeavored to suppress his writings, they exercised all of the devilish ingenuity of which they were capable to smother his magnetic personality, but they failed dismally in all of these things. The burly, brutal, barbaric von Bissing was no match for this keen, cultured, saintly man. He might torture him, but he could never vanquish him. He might murder him, but even the dull intellect of the slave-driver realized the stupidity of such a step. Mercier alive was a constant source of trouble, but Mercier dead surely would hasten the coming of the wrath of Heaven. It was the spirit which animated Cardinal Mercier that kept the Belgians free, even when they appeared to be hopelessly in the power of the Germans. They were forbidden to assemble in public meetings, but in spite of that edict they managed to join one another in caves, in secluded parts of the kingdom, and in places where their supposed conquerors never dreamt of looking. The things that happened at these secret gatherings may never be known to the world, but fortunately we have a brief extract from one memorable address which was made by the Cardinal to his small audience. Hear these inspiring words:

My brothers, I do not need to exhort you to persevere in your resistance of the invaders. I come rather to tell you how proud we are of you. A day does not go by without my receiving from friends of all nationalities letters of condolence which invariably terminate with the words, "Poor Belgium!" and I answer: No, no, not poor Belgium, but great Belgium, incomparable Belgium, heroic Belgium. On the map of the world it is only a tiny spot which many foreigners would not notice without the aid of a magnifying glass; but today there is not a nation in the world which does not render homage to this Belgium.

How grand and beautiful she is! If they could see her as we see her, they would know there is not a single Belgian who weeps or complains. I have not yet met on my way a single workman without work, a woman without resources, a mother in tears, a wife in mourning who was sorrowing.

This is what disconcerts the men who have been among us for a year. It is now just one year that they have been living among us, and they do not know us yet. They are stupefied. On one hand no one complains. We shall obey and shall continue to obey the regulations which they have imposed upon us by force, but on the other hand not one heart gives itself to them, and by the grace of God none will give itself to them. We have a King, one King, and we will continue to have one King until that great and glorious day when afflicted Belgium comes into its own once again!

For the third time we gaze upon the battle-scarred fields of Europe, and this time amid the roar of cannon and the smoke of conflict we behold a modest man in blue. To the casual observer he might seem like an ordinary person, but if we look closer we find that he has bright keen eyes, that he has a shrewd face and that he bears about him the unmistakable impress of power and authority. It is Ferdinand Foch, Marshal of France and the Generalissimo of the Allied forces. We know, upon the authority of military experts, that he is a master of

strategy, that he has the love and affection of his men, that he is quick to think and prompt to act. We know that in three short months, by following his carefully conceived plans, the power of the most autocratic States in Europe has crumbled into the dust. But what everybody does not realize is that this great soldier did not rely alone upon material resources. He had something else, and that something was faith, the Christian faith which moves mountains. With all of the greatness of genius he yet possessed the simplicity and the humility of a child. Curiously enough a graphic illustration of these qualities comes to us through an American soldier. It was given to one of our American boys, Private Evans of San Bernardino, California, to meet Marshal Foch at close range. He tells of it in a letter "to the folk back home." Hear the story as it is summarized from a letter in the *Los Angeles Times* of October 6, of this year:

Evans had gone into an old church near the French battle-front, and as he stood there with bared head, satisfying his respectful curiosity, a gray man with the eagles of a general on the collar of his shabby uniform also entered the church. Only one orderly accompanied the quiet, gray man. No glittering staff of officers, no entourage of gold-laced aides were with him; nobody but just the orderly.

Evans paid small attention at first to the gray man, but was curious to see him kneel in the church praying. The minutes passed until fully three-quarters of an hour had gone by before the gray man arose from his knees. Then Evans followed him down the street, and was surprised to see soldiers salute this man in great excitement, and women and children stopping in their tracks with awe-struck faces as he passed.

It was Foch, the French Marshal, the Commander-in-Chief of the Allied forces, the man who brought the Prussians to their knees.

Can there be any wonder that success perched upon the banners of the Allies under such leadership? Here was a man who embodied in his person both faith and works. A man who had the humility to go upon his knees in an old church while 10,000 guns were roaring on 100 hills, and the earth rocked with death. Can we be surprised that he went about his awful but necessary work with sublime confidence? We are told of one occasion when Premier Clemenceau stood on the battlefield with an anxious heart, how one look into the confident face of Foch stilled his fears. The agnostic doubted, the man of faith and humility did not doubt.

Here then we have the Providential trinity which saved civilization when it was toppling to destruction. The King, the Cardinal and the Marshal, the three men who played their parts in the greatest war the world has ever known. There were others and they will be celebrated in song and story, but all will concede that the trio under consideration will rank among the most heroic figures of the bloodiest conflict in history. In the course of time they will return to the dust from whence they came, but while the world lasts the memory of their deeds and their splendid faith will remain to stir the blood and gladden the hearts of those who come after them.

The Irish Issue in Its "Ulster" Aspect

WILLIAM J. M. A. MALONEY

"WE may safely state," writes Van Tyne ("Loyalists in the American Revolution," p. 183), "that 50,000 soldiers, either regular or militia, were drawn into the service of Great Britain from her American sympathizers." These American Loyalists were drawn from the adherents of English families such as "the Carterets and the Penns that had large financial interests in the country"; from those who "were in receipt of salaries as colonial officials"; from those "whose families had so long enjoyed the emoluments of office that they formed a class by themselves"; and from British military officers, pensioners and their kin (Channing, "History of the United States," vol. III, p. 362).

The present-day Ulster Loyalists are composed of English and Anglo-Irish peers who have large landed and financial interests in the country, many of whom, like Lord Londonderry, are descended from the men who sold the Irish Parliament to England; of those who, members of the vast Irish bureaucracy, are in receipt of salaries as Irish officials; of those whose families have so long enjoyed the emoluments of office that they form a class by themselves; of certain churchmen; and of British officers, pensioners, and their kin. Some idea of the Loyalism of the last class may be gathered from the fact that, even during the late war for the freedom of small nationalities, in the Sixteenth, the famous Irish division, although ninety-five per cent of the men were Nationalists, eighty-five per cent of the officers, and all above the lowest grades, were Ulsterites or other Unionists (T. P. O'Connor, House of Commons, March 7, 1917).

In 1776, the American Loyalists maintained that their families had been in possession of the land since its settlement; that they, as loyal subjects, "trembled at the thought of separation from England," which "was as necessary to America's safety as a parent to its infant children"; that "they were prosperous because they were British"; that "the country did not want independence"; that the whole agitation "was due to political adventurers of the worst type"; and that "the unfortunate land would be a scene of bloody discord for ages" if separated from England. "We were formed," said they, "by England's laws and religion. We were clothed with her manufactures and protected by her fleets and her armies" (Van Tyne, "The American Revolution," pp. 86 and 87).

Today the Ulster Loyalists maintain that their families have been in possession of the land since the colonizations by the Stuarts and Cromwell; that they tremble at the thought of separation from England; that they are formed by England's laws and religion and are protected by her fleets and armies; that Ireland does not want independence; that the whole agitation is due to adventurers of the worst type; that the unfortunate land would be a scene of bloody discord for ages if separated from Eng-

land; and that the English know better how to govern the Irish than the Irish do themselves. "By her sheer industry and her connection with England, Ulster has developed into the richest of the provinces (of Ireland). . . . The people of Ulster love the people of England and will not be driven out of the United Kingdom" (Lord Londonderry, *London Times*, April 6, 1914).

Now, however, there is little dispute in Ireland as to the possession of the land: even the peers who assert the contrary have been, or are in process of being, peacefully bought out by the Irish peasantry, Catholic and Protestant, Ulsterite and non-Ulsterite, with money lent under the terms of the Land acts of 1903 and 1909. Moreover, Ulster is not exclusively Protestant, for it contains 690,816 Catholics (45.67 per cent), out of a population of 1,581,696; in five of the nine Ulster counties Catholics are in the majority; and 17 of the 33 parliamentary representatives from Ulster are Nationalists. Besides, the Ulster Protestants are not wholly British; there is a considerable admixture of descendants of the Huguenots who came to Ulster after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes; and, as the Parliamentary returns show, many of the Protestants are Nationalists. Further, Ulster is not the richest of the provinces; the governmental ratable value of Leinster per head is 98 shillings; of Ulster only 72 shillings. The population of Ulster has fallen nearly thirty-three per cent in the last fifty years; this fall affects every county; and the infantile mortality, the best index of civic institutions, is appalling in the stronghold of Loyalism, Belfast, where it chances to be higher in the Protestant than in the Catholic sections. Ulster so far from glorying in citizenship of the British Empire, led, even as late as 1910, in the emigration from Ireland (Mr. John Redmond, London, March 1, 1912). Nevertheless, there are many prosperous Protestants in Ulster; and they are nearly all Loyalists.

When America was still a colony, "Protestant dissenters, descendants of the men who had held Londonderry, went in great numbers to America, where they became the most irreconcilable of those who sought separation from England" ("Ireland Today," p. 82, reprinted from *London Times*, 1913); and when America was fighting for freedom from England, these irreconcilable separatists, the Protestant Ulsterites, produced American leaders like Generals Richard Montgomery and Andrew Brown. The Irish Volunteers in 1782, assembling at Dungannon in Ulster, and consisting in goodly proportion of Protestant Ulsterites, extorted from England "perpetual" legislative independence for Ireland. In the '98, Protestant Ulsterites did some of the best fighting for the rebel cause. When the Ulster Protestant brotherhood with Britain was 140 years closer than it is today,

the chief question in Ulster was the independence of Ireland. Since those days there has been an apostolic succession of Ulster Protestants to lead the National cause in Ireland. But, nevertheless, in 1914, Lord Londonderry and kindred peers, with certain among the manifestly prosperous in Ulster, pledged themselves by covenant to resist partial legislative independence (Home Rule) for Ireland, set up an Ulster provisional government in Belfast, raised a volunteer corps to support that government, and thus asserted their right to rule Ireland on behalf of the Empire.

"I say here solemnly," announced one Ulster Loyalist who, in 1916, was rewarded with the position of Solicitor-General of Ireland, "that the day England casts me off, I will say, 'England! I will laugh at your calamity, I will mock when your fear cometh'" (Belfast, May 23, 1913). And another noteworthy Ulster Loyalist wrote in the *Irish Churchman* (Nov., 1913):

It may not be known to the rank and file of Unionists that we have the offer of aid from a powerful Continental monarch, who, if Home Rule is forced on the Protestants of Ireland, is prepared to send an army sufficient to release England of any further trouble in Ireland by attaching it to his dominion, believing, as he does, that if our King breaks his coronation oath by signing the Home Rule bill, he will, by so doing, have forfeited his claim to rule Ireland. And should our King sign the Home Rule bill, the Protestants of Ireland will welcome this Continental deliverer as their forefathers, under similar circumstances, did once before.

So some of the prosperous Ulster Loyalists seemed determined to maintain their sway in Ireland, even at the cost of transferring their loyalty from England.

To rouse the Ulster Loyalists, when Home Rule appeared imminent, the Rt. Hon. Walter Long, M. P., came from London to exhort them "to defend themselves by their own right arms and with their own stout hearts" (Newtownards, September 26, 1912). Sir F. E. Smith, M. P., also came from London, with the cry of "To your tents, O Israel!" (Ballyclare, September 20, 1913). And Sir Edward Carson, with his lieutenant, Captain Craig, proclaimed that the Ulsterites "would fight to the last ditch, to the last man." The distinguished Ulster Protestant to whom was deputed the task of writing the life of Carson, states:

The young men of Ulster . . . were not prepared to die in any ditch, first or last, in order to prevent the enactment of the Home Rule bill, and a reputable number of them were positively prepared to fight for its passage. Intimidation, ranging from threats of social ostracism to threats of dismissal from employment, was used to induce them to sign the covenant or join the Ulster Volunteers. There was talk of boycotting all Protestant Home Rulers, and there was an outburst of ill-will among men who had previously been on good terms. There were shameful scenes of violence in the shipyards, where gangs of infuriated Orange louts attacked isolated Catholic or Protestant Home Rulers and subjected them to acts of outrage and brutality which cannot be fitly described ("Sir Edward Carson," by St. John G. Ervine, p. 56). None of the business men of Ulster, old or young, had any taste for rebellion. They certainly had not the appetite for insurrection that their fathers had in 1798 (*loc. cit.*, p. 57).

No matter how it was in Ulster, there was no doubt of the feeling in England, where the following covenant was widely circulated for signature:

I,, shall hold myself justified in taking or supporting any action that may be effective to prevent it (the Home Rule act) being put into operation, and more particularly to prevent the armed forces of the Crown being used to deprive the people of Ulster of their rights as citizens of the United Kingdom.

Subscriptions were sought in England to support any action that might be effective. Long lists of signers and subscribers appeared at frequent intervals in the *London Times* and *Morning Post* during the spring and summer of 1914. The lists comprised the names of Dukes like Bedford, of Earls like Denbigh, of Bishops like Boyd Carpenter, of Barons, Baronets, Knights and lesser personages; of generals such as Roberts, of admirals such as Beresford, and of their subordinates in the military and naval services; of financiers and of others with industrial and political purpose, or with social ambition. Sir Edward Carson, who is not an Ulsterman, who has no discoverable relatives in Ulster, who never represented any Ulster constituency, and who was Solicitor-General for England from 1900 to 1906, was chosen to head the Loyalists of Ulster. Under him was an Englishman, General Richardson. Another Englishman, Sir F. E. Smith, came over to act as galloper to Carson. Retired English officers drilled the Carson army. General Sir Henry Wilson, who is now head of the British War Office, organized it. Generals French and Gough, in command of the British forces at the Curragh, resigned, or threatened to resign, with the officers of their command, if called upon by the British Government to march against their fellow-officers, Protestants and Britishers, of the Carson army. Berlin dispatches (March 31, 1914) informed the world that 50,000 rifles and 1,000,000 rounds of ammunition, "valued at £800,000," had been shipped from Hamburg on March 20. "It is assumed that the rifles are for Ulster," said the *London Times* of April 1. The *Fanny*, with the rifles aboard, was soon reported as passing through the Kiel Canal. On April 27 the *Times* was able to announce that the *Fanny*, having successfully eluded the entire and forewarned British navy, had peacefully landed its munitions in Ulster and peacefully departed. Among British politicians, Lord Milner, Lord Robert Cecil and all prominent Imperialists and Unionists, signed the covenant. The people of Ulster, declared the Rt. Hon. Joynson Hicks, M. P., at Warrington, England, on December 6, 1913, had behind them the Unionist party. *Behind them was the God of battles.* In His name and their name, he said to the Prime Minister, "Let your armies and batteries fire. Fire if you dare. Fire and be damned." An English peer, Lord Willoughby de Broke (Norwich, November 13, 1913), publicly announced: "We are enlisting, enrolling and arming a considerable force of volunteers who are going to proceed to Ulster to reinforce the ranks of Captain Craig and his brave men when the time comes."

With a pure and avowed passion to liberate from pending partial Irish rule their brothers in Ulster, their Protestant co-religionists, their fellow-citizens in the United Kingdom, their co-heirs in the British Empire, the Imperial aristocracy, the Imperial army, the Imperial navy, and the Imperial politicians of England, fomented in Ireland the act of revolution, and, in England, publicly aided and abetted it. And British "jurists, professors, editors, statesmen, warriors, and even scientists were prolific in finding reasons for the act before it was committed."

The British Imperialists who organized Carsonism had previously been busy in the Boer War, in the liberation of Protestant Britishers from the thrall of Protestant Burghers. According to the Englishman, Mr. H. G. Wells, "that sort of British Nationalism that is subsidized by rich Tories, international financiers and Ulster lawyers who are neither good Irish nor good English, where patriotism is really 'Britain for the British exploiter,' is 'sham nationalism' (*New Republic*, November 23, 1918). A Home Rule Ireland would have been an Ireland without economic or judicial or political or any other independence, an Ireland more subject to Britain than is Canada or any of Britain's self-governing dominions. Hence the avowed concern for the religious, national and imperial rights of the people of Ulster, which was used to sanctify British designs in Ireland, scarcely disguises the fact that a most unjust and pernicious enterprise was undertaken in England to support in Ireland a revolution without legitimate motive.

It may be recalled that in 1848 Bismarck, in the Reichstag, characterized the war of that year in Schleswig-Holstein, fomented by the German States, as "a most unjust, frivolous and pernicious enterprise, undertaken to support a revolution without legitimate motive." But he subsequently planned his autocratic German Empire and in the meantime Denmark's King had bestowed a democratic constitution on the Danish people. Bismarck in 1862 founded his first remonstrances to the Danish Government explicitly upon its too democratic character. At least one contemporary writer stated (Varnhagen von Ense, *Tagebücher*, vol. XIII, p. 428): "What Austria and Prussia seek at the hands of Denmark is not more regard to the Germanism of the Schleswig-Holstein, they do not care much about that. But the anti-German Ministry at Copenhagen is democratic; they want a reactionary one. That is the root of the matter." So the incentive of Imperialism together with the fear of an active democracy on his threshold, led Bismarck to say to himself, as he confessed at Friedrichsruhe, May 26, 1895, that Schleswig-Holstein must be German. Hazen ("Alsace-Lorraine under German Rule") and others have likewise shown that the military and profiteering need of German Imperialism, together with the dread of French democracy, incited the German lust for Alsace-Lorraine.

With Mr. Balfour's Ministry, which included Carson, Long, Bonar Law and others who were later to become

covenanting Carsonites, the British Imperialists suffered defeat in 1906, owing to the aftermath of the Boer War and the attempt to introduce Imperial preference. In their place a Liberal-Labor-Nationalist coalition appeared which conferred old-age pensions and government insurance upon the working classes, reinforced the power of labor unions, began to reclaim the feudal estates of England for the people, and disestablished the State Church in Wales. To accomplish these reforms, it was necessary to deprive the House of Lords of its summary veto over the popular will; which was safely accomplished. "For good or for evil," wrote in these days Sir F. E. Smith, the future Carson galloper, the future Attorney-General of England, "we are governed by a democracy. The apparent tendency is to extend rather than to restrict the popular character of our government. This country will remain democratic unless the tendency . . . be arrested by civil convulsions" ("Rights of Citizenship," p. 22). The Imperialists failed by constitutional means to control this tendency in two successive elections within one year. They had lost the power to veto the will of the people in the House of Lords; but, making the Home Rule bill both an occasion and an excuse, they provoked civil convulsions in Ireland, and conveyed that veto power safely to a chapel of ease in Ulster, where they created Carsonism to be its armed guard. They seduced the Imperial army and navy so that arbitrary power opposed the enforcement of a statute of the democratic government of Britain. "The Government which gave the order . . . to enforce the law in Ulster would run a great risk of being lynched in London," announced the leader of the Unionist party, Mr. Bonar Law (London, June 18, 1912), a hint to incite that mob and to terrorize its indicated victims. The Rt. Hon. Joynson Hicks, M. P., daring and damning, in the name of the God of battles and of the Unionist party, the democratic government of England, disclosed the forces supporting his leader. And the armed volunteers raised in England by Lord Wiltoughby de Broke likewise effectively tended to restrict the popular character of government in England. The British incentives to Carsonism were not only the military and profiteering needs of Imperialism in Ireland, but also the Imperialist dread of democracy in England.

The annexationist maxim in the days of Frederick the Great was: "Seize first and plenty of lawyers will justify afterwards." But with the development of the "Christian Science" of war, war ceased to be the pursuit of an exclusive military caste and became instead a national function. Hence, to unify and strengthen the national will to war, the German leaders, planning to rob their neighbors, organized appeals to the moral and sentimental feelings of the German people. Thus, before he proceeded to the conquest of Schleswig-Holstein, Bismarck created a popular claim to the coveted territory on the ground of colonization by Germans in the thirteenth century: fellow-Germans in Schleswig-Holstein must be restored to the benefits of Teutonism and of

German citizenship. The validity of this claim may be judged by the fact that on July 26, 1720, England had guaranteed perpetual possession of the disputed territory to Denmark; and France had done likewise in August 18, of the same year. Bismarck encouraged in Denmark the hope that England would intervene, a hope in which Denmark entered the war of 1864. As Lord Palmerston had no intention of intervening to save Denmark, English public opinion on the Schleswig issue was made then by Bismarck, as American public opinion on the Irish issue is made today by the Carsonites. Lord Palmerston was accurately reflecting the popular understanding in England when, as was his habit, he would say: "The question of Schleswig is so complicated and obscure that only three European statesmen have grasped it thoroughly: the first of these, Prince Albert, is unhappily dead; the second, a foreign politician, has lost his reason; and the third is myself, but I have unfortunately forgotten it." When the time approached for the annexation of Alsace-Lorraine, German "jurists, professors, editors, statesmen, warriors and even scientists were prolific in finding reasons for the act before it was committed" (Hazen, *loc. cit.* p. 78). Ancient Allaman colonizations were recalled; the descendants of the original Teutonic colonists were identified as fellow-Germans, enslaved in France by the Treaty of Westphalia (1646); and marked down for liberation, for restoration to the religious, national and prospective imperial rights of German citizens. And to silence any lingering scruple, Treitschke taught: "The Germans know how to govern the Alsations better than the Alsations do themselves."

The complexity and obscurity of these German national issues recently vanished. A selectively enlightened world suddenly learned to appreciate at its true value this conventional plea of religious, national and imperial rights of German colonists in coveted lands; and to see, at last, that there never was adequate reason to regard that plea as other than a most unjust, frivolous and pernicious subterfuge of German Imperialism. The German Imperialist demonstrably had both in Schleswig-Holstein and in Alsace-Lorraine no purpose distinguishable from that which the British Imperialist still has in Ireland, and still makes complex and obscure by the stereotyped plea of religious, national and imperial rights of British colonists in Ulster. The world today has just paid the price of refusal to see as they were the things of yesterday. Will the world tomorrow need likewise to pay the price of refusal to see as they are the things of today?

So long as England governs Ireland, the privileged, the parasitic, and the professional Loyalists will exercise their religious, national, and imperial right to administer, on behalf of the Empire, the satrapy of Ireland. So long as these Loyalists control in Ireland the avenues of educational, economic, and social preferment, they will find adherents among the ignorant and sophisticated,

the needy and covetous, the servile and ambitious. The number and devotion of such adherents were revealed in the last great British recruiting campaign, in which all the arts of persuasion and menace, intensively applied for six months, brought forth from Belfast and all Ulster less than 10,000 Loyalists to save the Empire that is England in the hour of its extremity. Fifty thousand American Loyalists opposed Washington: yet America became a great and harmonious nation. Six thousand German Loyalists form Masaryk's Ulster quota in the newly created nation of Czecho-Slovakia. Yet the negligible number of Irish Loyalists, in a world where the principle of majority rule is the foundation of all democracy, is allowed to impose for their Imperial masters an insuperable veto to "the government of Ireland by the consent of the governed."

In the negotiation of the Home Rule Act and in the deliberations of the Lloyd George convention, the National leaders of Ireland manifested for the religious and civil rights of the Loyalist minority a solicitude that transcends justice, and that may worthily serve as an example to the majority rulers of newly-freed States. Outside of its incubation place in Ulster, antagonism of Catholic to Protestant, of Irishman to Irishman, does not exist in Ireland. Major William Redmond, M.P., in his last speech to the British House of Commons, before he went to his grave in Flanders, irrefutably proved the mutual esteem and affection that united the vast armies of Irish soldiers in the trenches of France. Dissension in Ireland is incomparably less than dissension in England, or France, or Italy; and as it was in America in 1776, it is in Ireland today the work of those who desire to divide and rule.

Washington characterized the American precursors of the Carson family as "abominable pests of society"; and treated them as traitors. The Virginia House of Delegates stigmatized them as "vicious citizens against whom vigorous measures should be taken": and such measures were taken. Bismarck replied, when asked what he meant to do with his exalted analogue of Carson in Schleswig-Holstein: "It is the right of him who rears a cockerel to wring its neck": and that Carson was heard no more. The right of England to her Carson, no Irishman will care to contest.

As soon as the disrupting force of dual allegiance ceases to act in Ireland, as soon as Ireland is governed only by the consent of the governed, Ulsterite will vie with non-Ulsterite in salutary competition to end the present exploitation of the poor, the ignorant, the credulous and the bigoted, to eradicate the existing impieties of the social system of Ireland, and to make all men equal before the law: that selfish rights may be displaced by national duties, and that the life of everyone may conform to the first and greatest of the laws of the nation, the law that all Irishmen shall unite to fulfill the work of all, the work of the free people of Ireland in the federation of the peoples of the world.

A Plea for Reading

B. J. REILLY

MUCH has been written in praise of books. They have furnished amusement, given comfort and broadened culture. Some read to while away the time. They pick up a book at haphazard and read on until they finish it with delight or throw it away half unread. They seek no guidance. In this way they waste valuable time on books that are not worth reading. Where there is an embarrassment of riches, there is no excuse for such carelessness. There is a choice of old books which have stood the test of time, and generally a person can easily find modern books which are worth reading. It is advisable to try to become acquainted with the books which will help towards a liberal education. If the reader seeks no guidance in this matter, he will lose a portion at least of his time in running through trash. It is quite impossible to keep up with the new books that are printed, and then there are the old masterpieces which still remain on the shelves unread. Life is short and time is fleeting. There are other duties to be performed and only a minimum of time is left for books. Why waste it browsing in unknown fields of literature without a guide? Let the literary critics become your guides. They may be woefully wrong sometimes; they may occasionally lead you astray; but in the main you can follow them, and thus save many precious hours for the reading of books worth while, the great masterpieces of all time.

I have seen it stated that if a person would devote himself to books fifteen minutes every day he would in time attain to culture. This is very encouraging news to busy people. For no doubt each day much time is wasted, and it can be easily applied to the reading of splendid books. No matter how busy one may be, a few moments can be stolen daily for converse with the "mighty minds of old" or better acquaintance with more modern writers. In olden days a person might have a taste for reading and yet find it difficult to indulge it owing to the scarcity of books; but this cannot be used as an excuse in these days. If a person has a desire to read, generally books are easily had. A book, or preferably several books, should be always at hand; then a busy man can pick them up any spare moment.

Wasted time! With a little watchfulness how much of it could be saved to cultivate the mind. People will tell you that they are fond of books, but that they get no time for reading. Nonsense! They are not fond of books or they would make time. Note the time given to the daily newspaper. A friend once told me that he began his morning paper at the top of the first column on the first page and continued on, column after column, until he had read everything. "In that way I do not miss anything," he informed me. That may be a thorough way of reading a paper, but it is likely to consume

more time that the entire contents of the paper are worth.

One writer has deplored this waste of time. He says that if he had omitted two columns a day in the newspapers, which were given mainly to murder trials or the romance of the reporter concerning such crimes, in ten years he would have saved time enough to finish a respectable course in history. We dwell too long on our morning newspaper. During the afternoon and evening we are likely to pick up one or more papers, especially to read the "funny page." In other days the afternoon newspaper was to a certain extent a literary paper. You were supposed to get all the news in the morning, and turn to the afternoon or evening paper for something that would cultivate the mind. Of course, during these fretful days we are all naturally eager to hear the news from the war front and to find out what our brave boys are doing in France or elsewhere. One is not criticising this natural anxiety, but in normal conditions we give too much time to newspaper reading.

Some ask: "What books shall I read?" There should be little difficulty in this matter. Many lists of books have been selected and recommended. Many of those who give advice on the choice of books demand that the reader have a special aim in all his reading. No doubt there is much to be said in favor of this plan, but at the same time a great deal of enjoyment will come to the desultory reader and, I believe, much profit also. If a person has a hobby he can read along that particular line. In fact if one has a hobby, it is scarcely necessary to recommend books to him; he will find them himself. Lord Brougham once said: "It is well to read everything of something and something of everything." Reading should not be confined to a hobby. A catholic taste should be cultivated. Emerson's rule, "When a new book comes out read an old one," contains good advice. The old one has stood the test of time; the new one may be trash.

Of course, new books have a charm. Many people say that the modern novel is not worth reading, and that with Dickens, Thackeray and Scott the novel ended. It is true we have no such great authors writing at present, but still there are brave and interesting books published every year. We cannot confine all our reading to the classics. The books of our own time have an interest of their own. They discuss the ideas that are prevalent amongst us.

Some of the old books treat of dead issues; the modern ones elucidate for us the absorbing questions of the day. It is told of Cardinal Manning that when he went to the Athenæum Club, in London, he sought out the corner of the library in which the new books were kept and spent his time dipping into them.

It is inevitable when one is discussing books that the question will arise as to which books are moral and which are not. The Church has been condemned by some as a tyrant because she has always had an "Index." A mother reserves the right to care for her children's morals, why should not the Church, which is our mother in a spiritual sense, guide her children in this matter? In France, where many meretricious books are published, young people are protected against them, as they should be. In England and in our own country no such latitude is allowed to authors as in France, but still many books are published which are decidedly immoral. There is very little supervision of the reading of young folks practised in our own country.

Mrs. Malaprop used to say "that a circulating library in a town is an evergreen tree of diabolical knowledge." The old lady was very severe in her condemnation. A circulating library or public libraries, as we have them, are a blessing in a town for those who are fond of books and whose purses do not permit them to buy all the books they desire to read. Yet on the shelves of these libraries repose books which it is not well for children and young people to read. Of course, the times change and we change with them. When Charlotte Brontë wrote "Jane Eyre" there was a storm of disapproval. One critic said that he did not believe any woman could be brutal enough to write "Jane Eyre." If Miss Brontë wrote her well-known book in our days, it would not cause such a scandal. We have become accustomed to a more open discussion of things.

But there are too few restrictions thrown around the reading given to the young. Our modern young girl is supposed to be a salamander. She can go through fire and not be burned. She is a law unto herself. Someone said of a play the tone of which was not moral, that "It was the kind of a play a careful young woman would not take her mother to see."

It is certain that one cannot read all the books that are printed, Augustine Birrell estimated some years ago that there must be 300,000,000 books in Europe and America, not counting bibles and prayer books. And he figured that this would make a poor showing if the books were divided per capita; less than two apiece. Be that as it may, there are books enough and to spare for everyone.

Since there are so many books that one wishes to read, and since there is not time enough to read them, a person must resort occasionally at least to the art of skipping. To skip, with some people, is a crime, yet by skipping we save time to read many more books. Some books we may find to be potboilers, some full of padding; some have much that is irrelevant; some dull in parts, while some contain matter that does not interest us. Why lose precious time, when we will gain neither profit or amusement?

Judicious skipping is much to be recommended. It will furnish time to ponder upon the great thoughts

that we may come upon in books. Lord Bacon's well known advice seems to recommend skipping. Speaking of books, he says: "Some are to be tasted, others to be swallowed and some few to be chewed and digested; that is, some books are to be read only in parts; others to be read but not curiously; and some few to be read wholly and with diligence and attention." Brother Azarias in his volume, "Books and Reading," dilates on this passage from Bacon and gives the following rules: First, Read with attention. Second, Set aside daily according to leisure or occupation a given portion of time for reading. Third, Focus the attention during the time of reading in such manner that the mind becomes wholly occupied with the reading matter. Fourth, Read with method. Fifth, Take notes while reading. Sixth, Consult your dictionary. Seventh, Read with a purpose. Eighth, Remember that is the best reading which tends to growth of character as well as to intellectual development.

All who are fond of reading will attest to the fact that books are great companions and consolers. Frequently, too, they influence our lives. Charles Lamb said that "Heaven would not be Heaven for him if there were no books there." A lover of books will open a new volume with the greatest anticipation and excitement. It is the beginning of a beautiful adventure. I have read much of the influence and potentiality of books, but Robert Chambers, a friend of Sir Walter Scott, seems to have obtained from books more consolation than anyone else I have ever read of. He says that leaving home after vacation and going back to school was a dreadful woe to him, and yet he had only to take up "Robinson Crusoe," and in a few minutes he forgot the approaching calamity. When he grew up and proposed marriage to Jemima Anne by letter, Scott's "Ivanhoe" kept him from becoming a drivelling idiot while he was awaiting a reply. When the answer came back in the negative, Carlyle's "French Revolution" preserved him from the noose, the razor or the stream. In the woes of poor Louis Capet he forgot his own. He ends by saying: "Who having a grateful heart can forget these things or deny the blessedness of books?" We may not get as much consolation out of books as did this Robert Chambers, but if we get a tithe only of what he got, books will have proved a good investment.

No doubt there may come a time when you will grow a little tired of books. Chaucer loved books, but even he tells us,

When that the month of May
Is comen, and that I here the foules syng,
And that the floures gynnen for to sprynge,
Farwel my boke and my devocion.

Some distraction may cause us to forget our books for a time. This need not discourage us. There is a story told of Robert Walpole, how he tried book after book in his magnificent library, and at last with tears in his eyes exclaimed: "It is all in vain, I cannot read."

There may come such times to all of us, but they will not last. Augustine Birrell declares: "We all know the dark hour when the vanity of learning and the childishness of merely literary things are brought home to us in such a way as almost to avail to put the pale student out of conceit with his books and make him turn from his best beloved authors as from a friend, who has outstayed his welcome, whose carriage we wish were at the door." Those dark hours will come to all book-lovers, but they are only trials which patiently borne will pass away. The love of reading will return to us.

I was quite shocked to find William Hazlett saying in his essay, "On Reading Old Books," "Books have in a great measure lost their power over me; nor can I revive the same interest in them as formerly. The sharp luscious flavor, the fine aroma, is fled and nothing but the stalk, the bran, the husk of literature is left. If anyone were to ask me what I read now, I might answer with my Lord Hamlet in the play, words, words, words." Whether this was a passing humor with Hazlett I do not know. Charles Lamb would never have written thus.

Books are good friends, which will while away many an hour, and next to our prayers bring us more consolation and refreshment than we can get from any other source. Thus Andrew Lang sings:

Fate, thou art queen by shore and sea,
We bow submissive to thy will,
Ah, grant by some benign decree,
The books I love, to love them still.

One might adduce endless testimony in proof of the great profit, pleasure and consolation to be got from books. All great writers urge the cultivation of a habit

of reading. Some books which are recommended may prove hard reading. But reading is a taste that must be cultivated. The ephemeral book is gradually outgrown. Taste improves, but an effort will be necessary. Let me recall to you Frederick Harrison's test:

If "The Cid," the "Vita Nuova," the "Canterbury Tales," Shakespeare's Sonnets pall on a man; if he care not for Malory's "Morte d'Arthur" and the "Red Cross Knight"; if he thinks "Crusoe" and the "Vicar" books for the young; if he thrill not with the "Ode to the West Wind" and the "Ode to a Grecian Urn"; if he have no stomach for "Christabel" or the lines written on the "Wye Above Tintern Abbey," he should fall on his knees and pray for a cleaner and quieter spirit.

These, Mr. Harrison says, are simple pieces which may serve as an unerring test of a healthy or a vicious taste. But such a test should discourage no one. Mr. Harrison might have made it harder. It is not a difficult one, but if a person finds it so, let them remember that literature is a vast storehouse where he will find much to his own liking. His taste will gradually grow better.

If a person is young and as yet has no taste for the classical works of literature, he should begin by reading what interests him. It is better to do this than to attempt the "mountain tops" and then give up, discouraged. Once he acquires a fondness for books he is on the highway to culture. A little effort and a little patience and his taste will improve and his fondness for reading will increase. He will then believe Thomas à Kempis when he says: "I have found the greatest pleasure in little nooks with little books," and he will agree with Mr. Birrell when he exclaims: "Great is bookishness and the charm of books."

A Substitute for Militarism

JOHN A. RYAN, D. D.

"IN place of armies, the institution of arbitration with its lofty pacificatory function, in accordance with rules and sanctions to be determined upon against the State that should refuse either to submit international questions to such arbitration or to accept its decision."

"A general association of nations must be formed under specific covenants for the purpose of affording mutual guarantees of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small States alike."

The first of these statements is found in Pope Benedict's peace appeal of August, 1917. The second is the last of the famous fourteen propositions laid down last January by President Wilson. While each of them puts emphasis upon a different feature of the project, both call for the same international institution. It is what has generally come to be designated as a "League of Nations."

In a summary way, this projected organization may be described as a combination of all, or practically all, the nations to maintain international tribunals of conciliation

and arbitration, and to provide an international army and navy for the purpose of carrying out the regulations and decisions of that tribunal. The ultimate objects of the League are to render national wars nearly, if not quite, impossible, and great national armaments unnecessary.

The scheme has won the earnest support of organized labor and all other democratic-minded persons on both continents, and it has been formally accepted as one of the basic conditions of peace in connection with the armistice recently signed by all the belligerent nations. It is opposed by Imperialists, by jingoistic Nationalists, and by all persons who have not taken the trouble to examine it, or to reflect soberly on the failure of the policy of great national armaments. The objections raised against it by one or other of these groups are mainly two: A League of Nations is contrary to human nature, as we see from history, and it would involve an injurious limitation of national independence.

Undoubtedly the establishment and maintenance of such a revolutionary institution as a League of Nations will require great skill, prudence, faith, patience and sac-

rifices. The skill, and the intellectual requisites generally, will not be wanting. The chief difficulty relates to the moral qualities. Nevertheless, the outlook is immeasurably more hopeful than it has ever been before. For the first time in the world's history the project is earnestly desired by all classes of people. The fact that the majority of persons in nearly all countries now look upon the State less as an instrument and expression of national power and glory than as an agency for the promotion of the common and domestic good of all its members, has weakened if not destroyed many of the former causes of international animosity, jealousy and distrust. The great war has increased in all the peoples respect for the rights of other nations, mistrust of force and national armaments, and willingness to make some sacrifice of national claims and power for the sake of world peace. In his excellent address on behalf of the scheme, delivered a few months ago, Viscount Grey declared that the effectiveness of a League of Nations depends, first, upon the sincerity of those who enter it, and, second, upon their willingness to impose some limitation to their national freedom of action. Both these attitudes are now exhibited by the nations in far greater measure than ever before in human history. This development and intensity of international feeling can and should be utilized to establish, as President Wilson insists, the League, at the sessions of the peace conference itself, not afterward.

In view of these and many other significant conditions which now exist for the first time, it seems reasonable to conclude that the ancient objection from human nature no longer rests upon an adequate basis of fact.

The attempt to bolster up this general objection by recounting previous efforts toward an international organization for peace is not particularly happy or persuasive. Colonel Roosevelt and others have likened the proposed League of Nations to the Holy Alliance which was formed in 1815 by the governments of Austria, Prussia, Russia and approved by England. Yet the differences between the two are more important than the resemblances. The Holy Alliance embraced only a few of the nations; it rested upon no more definite basis than a general aspiration for world peace; it formulated no sufficiently specific immediate ends, nor created any practical organization or instruments either for international arbitration or international police; and finally it was doomed to failure from the outset because it was put together under the direction of the notorious and cynical Metternich, and was a union of monarchs rather than free peoples. President Wilson and all the other earnest and intelligent advocates of the League of Nations have invariably insisted that it must be formed by democratic nations, possessing democratic conceptions of political justice and using democratic methods of publicity and diplomacy. These conditions are vital; for, as compared with autocracies and oligarchies democratic States are less militaristic and less eager to encroach upon their neighbors, have more faith in open agreements and less faith in force, and be-

lieve more sincerely in the theory that the purpose of the State is the welfare of its own people rather than international power and glory. The fundamental reason and explanation of these differences is the fact that democratic governments are inclined and impelled to give greater considerations to the principles of morals. The very emergence of democratic States is due to a specifically ethical conception, to the doctrine that all human beings are endowed with certain rights which autocracies and oligarchies have generally ignored. Therefore, democratic governments are more likely to seek sincerely the means of international justice than governments that habitually place their main reliance upon force.

The second objection to a League of Nations refers mainly to the undesirability of requiring States to submit *all* differences to arbitration, and the impossibility of enforcing unfavorable decisions upon the more powerful States. An example of the first difficulty is found in the Monroe Doctrine. The obvious rejoinder is that long established and internationally beneficial principles and prerogatives of this sort need not come under the jurisdiction of the League. Indeed, they should be accepted and affirmed by the League beforehand, as desirable and permanent institutions. In the second place, certain "vital" questions and "questions of national honor" could be made subject to consideration by the international court, with the reservation that the decision would not be obligatory, but only hortatory. In most cases the period of discussion and delay, together with the moral authority of the decision of the court, would produce such mutual understanding and accommodation as to prevent a declaration of war. Finally, it would not always be necessary to enforce even an obligatory decision by means of shot and shell. An international commercial boycott of the obstinate nation would probably suffice in the great majority of instances. An excellent summary of the various means of enforcing decisions, as well as of all the other aspects of a League of Nations, will be found in the *Nineteenth Century*, Sept., 1918, pp. 485-506.

It is not necessary that all the ultimate powers of the League should be brought into full operation the day after it is organized. According as national armaments are gradually diminished—at a rate and within a time determined when the League was formed—the powers and functions of the League could be gradually increased. This method would not only provide a more sure and stable foundation for the League, but minimize the shock to mistaken national pride.

Some opponents of the project grudgingly concede that the idea might be partially realized in a union of America and the Allies, the Central Powers being excluded, at least for a long period of years. This suggestion is worse than futile. Sooner or later the countries left out of the exclusive combination would reconstruct their huge armies and navies for self-protection and form an alliance of their own. Thus all the nations would be again com-

mitted to competitive armaments, the "balance of power," and the inevitable war. Moreover, there is no assurance that the Allies would continue to dwell together in peace and harmony. The imperialistic and aggressive designs that most of them revealed in the now famous "secret treaties," made during the first two years of the war, show a capacity for selfishness that would before many years land their alliance upon the rocks. Indeed, the very spirit that informed such a one-sided combination, would be fatal to its permanence.

The contention that Germany could not be trusted as a member of a League of Nations is vitally defective at two points. It assumes that the rulers and the temper of the German people will always remain the same as before the war. In view of the revolution that is now in action, this assumption seems to be somewhat rash. The probability is that the future governments of Germany will be more hostile to their own former system and all its works than to the Allied nations. In the second place, all necessary safeguards could be taken by admitting Germany to the League conditionally; she could be restricted to a smaller degree of influence than would be normally due her, until such time as she proved herself entirely worthy of full membership. Even Lord Robert Cecil declares that Germany ought to be admitted to the League from the beginning.

The case for a League of Nations is simply this: America and the other great nations must either establish it, or continue the policy of great national armaments. Experience warns us that the latter course involves intolerable burdens and leads with moral certainty to war, while the present attitude of the world assures us that the outlook for a League of Nations is sufficiently promising to make the project worthy of an earnest trial.

Catholics are called upon to show an especially active sympathy and cooperation with the scheme. Pope Benedict has made an explicit declaration in favor of it and against national armaments, and his Secretary of State, Cardinal Gaspari, has pointed out that one of the chief means of attaining these objects is the abolition of compulsory and universal military service in times of peace. One of the reproaches directed against Catholic leaders in the great militaristic countries of Europe was that they gave merely perfunctory and abstract support to the peace-efforts of former Pontiffs; that they failed to do the one thing of any concrete value, namely, to strive for universal disarmament and international arbitration. Shall we repeat this history, in America? Up to the present our press has been all but entirely silent, and no sympathetic voice has been raised in any more authoritative circle. The time is short.

Wenceslaus or Hus?

JOSEPH A. VAUGHAN, S.J.

THE Czecho-Slovaks are now free. President Wilson has recognized the independence of Moravia and Bohemia. Immediately it becomes the duty of every newspaper editor, magazine writer and super-illuminating scribe to pass that little-

known corner of the earth in review. And, sad to say, the narrations are such that historians will be tempted to think that the popular writers have

... eaten of the insane root
That takes the reason prisoner.

Or is it that "the fatal divorce of reason and passion" has obscured their vision? Certainly it is not lack of education nor experience nor perhaps of good-will, but rather maybe a certain poverty of disposition which manifests itself by the indolence or inability to seek the sources of knowledge; not active opposition to truth, but passive indifference. An unconscious world will believe anything. An editor is not necessarily an encyclopedia, Arthur Brisbane to the contrary notwithstanding. And someone has wisely remarked knowledge does not consist in knowing everything, but in knowing where to find it.

Behind every great wave of patriotism there must be found a personality, either past or present. Belgium has its Albert, England its Haig, France its Foch and America its Pershing. So, too, these heralds of Moravian and Bohemian glories here in our American land have glanced into the depths of history, depths that are far from transparent, and lo, they have discovered John Hus. Hus, the liberator; Hus the man, whose spirit shall free a bonded nation from the German rule. Did their encyclopedic knowledge fail to descry the anachronism? Hus, a Catholic priest and advocate of the doctrines of Wyclif, already condemned in England, died in 1415; Bohemia and Moravia came under the rule of the Hapsburgs in 1526, 111 years after the death of Hus. But why quibble about dates? Hus was a liberator; it makes no difference whether he sought to free the mind from the spiritual authority of Rome or the legal authority of the Hapsburgs. A man must be found, a personality, even though Catholicism and Germany be identified.

There followed the Hussite wars, lasting over a period of thirty years, all taking place about 100 years before the Hapsburgs came into power. What was the origin of these wars? History reveals that 452 Moravian and Bohemian nobles, gathering together, took up the gauntlet and appended their seals to a joint note to the King and Council (Constance), setting forth their conviction that the sentence of Hus was unjust and insulting to their country; that there were no heresies in Bohemia, that any assertion to the contrary was itself the gravest heresy. This document is dated September 2, 1415. Three days later the nobles formed an offensive and defensive league. Armed crowds invaded the churches and monasteries, drove out all priests and monks unwilling to submit, robbed them of their possessions, and replaced them with Utraquist clergy, i. e., clergy who would administer Communion to the Faithful "under both kinds," *sub utraque specie*. It is noteworthy that Hus himself never taught Utraquism. Since the then Emperor, Sigismund, a man sprung from their own soil and not a scion of the Hapsburgs, was allied with the Council, naturally these wars took on the aspect of a revolt. But was it a revolt against the Hapsburgs? And shall we now say that Hus, dead these 500 years, was the first to recognize and repudiate the tyrannical sway of Germany? Enough gruesome, glaring truths lie ready at hand for the man who would slay with the pen; why dig falsehoods out of the depths of the past? Fanaticism, recognizing neither law nor equity, considers at the present time all means legitimate provided it can besmirch an enemy, compromise whom else it may. One writer in his frenzied zeal even regrets that Blücher arrived in time to save Wellington at Waterloo. Shades of Napoleon; do they not rise and dance with laughter? What were England's thoughts on this subject prior to 1914?

The facts about Bohemia and Moravia of today are both illuminating and astounding. Latest statistics set forth that Bohemia has a population of 6,458,389, of which 6,210,385 are Catholics. A nation ninety-six per cent Catholic! Of the 200,000 non-Catholics, over 92,000 are Jews. Moravia has a population of

2,437,706, of which 2,325,574 are Catholics, almost 100 per cent Catholic. Of the non-Catholics 44,255 are Jews. What then has happened to the valiant Hussites? Have they suffered a change of heart and returned to the Fold, or have they, growing tired of the conflict with imperial Germany, emigrated to other parts? To those who have the patience and courage to stand by their guns and bear the brunt of battle belong the spoils and glories of victory. Today not the Hussites who long since gave up the battle, but their more valorous and heroic Catholic countrymen the world must candidly acclaim. And President Wilson in recognizing the independence of Moravia and Bohemia, though he and thousands of others may not know it, has recognized the freedom of the most wholly Catholic republic on earth.

To whom in its hour of triumph does this new-born republic turn for its inspiration, its patriotism? Not to Hus, methinks, whom Catholics rejected 500 years ago, but to that gentle sainted King and Martyr, Wenceslaus, famed alike in sacred and profane legends. He loved God above all, and his people next to God. His regal power begot neither tyranny nor pride nor arrogance. His hands were reddened not with the blood of his nation but with the juice of the grape soon to become the blood of his God. His one earthly pleasure, more heavenly indeed than earthly, was found in crushing with his own hands the fruit of the vine and harvesting the wheat destined for the altar of God. Such was the man who inspired the entire nation up to the days of the Hussites. Today a man should be chosen who will renew in the hearts of a new-born people devotion to country and devotion to God. Is that man Wenceslaus or Hus?

COMMUNICATIONS

Letters, as a rule, should not exceed six-hundred words.

Constructive Social Principles

To the Editor of AMERICA:

In AMERICA for November 9, Mr. Burke offered some very pointed remarks on the above subject. The same thoughts had long been struggling in my bewildered brain for objective existence. He is not the only one that has felt the need of some concrete, tangible evidence of the social philosophy we possess. I may be wrong, but it is my humble opinion that it is not from a shortage or deficiency of principles we suffer, but of men courageous enough to give them their logical conclusions. Surely, the Gospel is not devoid of a social philosophy substantial and broad enough to embrace mankind in all its devious ways! Dr. Ryan's works, though not a compendium of Catholic social philosophy, give ample proof that its existence is no idle dream. They are a great advance in the way. Yet the sudden and swift changes that are astir in the world demand quick and decisive thought, else we shall be swept along with forces that are now on the top of the waves. The ordinary run of Catholics know not where to move; they are confused by a thousand questions and in vain do we try to check their fears by appeal to that anchor of hope: all will be well; the storm will blow itself away. They have grown accustomed to the sound of a living voice, now they strain their ears to hear it.

The ordinary man likes a solid definite pronouncement on the great question of capital and labor. If this is not forthcoming from his Church, he will hear one from another source. The Radicals have not only driven us into the retreat of scornful, helpless silence, but have seized the reigns of government in all the new-formed European States and are well on the way to extend their reign elsewhere. Days are coming when a war-platform cannot be used, and the patriotism of a people will not win the day. We thought the Center party in Germany all powerful, but Mathias Erzberger was given the distinction of becoming the chief witness only of the old order's doom. Radical Socialism is wildly triumphant in the former Catholic Austrian-Hungarian Empire. Perhaps some subtle philosopher will detect some psychological reason to prove that this is only

a temporary triumph of the Radicals in the swing of sudden reaction, but it is my humble opinion they were successful because they promised something, something definite and tangible to the newly delivered people. They appealed to that ever dormant and watchful passion of envy. It is a gross response, for "Not in bread alone doth man live," but while we are theorizing and appealing to generalities and principles, people are pining for bread and the decencies of life. Perhaps, it may ultimately prove a good thing that people are getting experience of wild radical theories translated into reality, but it is a dangerous thing to use poison for medicine. Russia, I venture, would not repeat the experiment. The sorrowful fact remains, while we sit complacently admiring our principles in fancied security, the Church is being hourly dispoiled of her most precious treasures, souls, for, for every one brought into the fold by theological learning (I doubt if they are many) Socialism takes two out by the back door. This is the writer's sad personal experience. Only these who labor among our foreign population realize it in all its poignancy.

The peace-bells chime strange music to some ears. Blessed peace! It has ended one conflict, it has precipitated another. Arise some prophet with vision strong and clear enough to see through the perplexities of the interminable principles that bewilder and distress us; arise with courage to face and battle the storm outside and look unmoved into the icy stare of the outraged conservatism that frowns on us from on high.

New York.

M. I. GRIFFIN.

America's Verdict on Socialism

To the Editor of AMERICA:

It would indeed be gratifying if we could accept "America's Verdict on Socialism" (AMERICA, November 16, 1918) as stating the case as it is in fact. For we must measure the progress of Catholicism in our country in reverse ratio to the acceptance by the public mind of Socialist propaganda. And, since the Socialist vote is the objective guide in making a correct estimate of Socialism's baleful influence amongst us, we can find little to be jubilant about upon the political field.

While the Socialist gubernatorial vote in New York City, as compared with last year's mayoralty vote, does show a falling off, it appears that a fairer comparison would be the 85,600 votes cast in Greater New York during the recent gubernatorial election with the 38,500 votes received by the Socialist candidate in the preceding gubernatorial contest. This method of comparison would show that in two years the Bolshevik element round about the AMERICA office has increased over 47,000, by more than half. Again, when in the Twelfth, Thirteenth, Fourteenth and Twentieth Congressional districts of New York the two old parties find it necessary to form a coalition to defeat London, Hillquit, Nearing and Lee, when patriotism is fanned into a bright flame, the verdict must be that there is a rising tide of un-Americanism that threatens our civil welfare. Moreover, Congressman London's defeat is no doubt due, in part, to the opposition to his record that exists within his own party. He came very nearly losing the Socialist party nomination. He was condemned by his party organization for voting for the \$7,000,000,000 war-credit bill; one of his addresses in Congress was repudiated. Mr. London's apology to Congress for expressing the view that the "disfranchised" Porto Ricans "have a right to use the revolver," "to use violence," and "to kill governors" stirred the ire of his comrades throughout the country. London's Socialism is of the Kerensky type rather than the Trotsky type, and the New York Socialists have little favor for that.

It is true that Van Lear was defeated in his recent run for reelection as Mayor of Minneapolis. Yet a vote of about 27,500 against the 28,800 of his opponent shows that the Socialists are still to be reckoned with in that locality. Especially so when they

are reported to have gained three additional seats in the City Council, to have elected a Sheriff in Hennepin County and to have gained five seats in the Minnesota Legislature.

The Socialist vote in Milwaukee shows that city to be the Berlin of America. In addition to Berger's election to Congress, by over 5,500 plurality, the Socialists elected every candidate they nominated in Milwaukee County, viz: district attorney, sheriff, county clerk, clerk of courts, county treasurer, registrar of deeds and coroner. The increased legislative vote gives them seventeen seats in the Wisconsin Assembly and five in the Wisconsin Senate.

All this progress has been made in the face of the Federal indictments against the foremost Socialist leaders for violation of the Espionage act. These gains have been made too despite the cry of Russell that "Socialism is absolutely dead in this country." From many signs within the movement the Marxian Socialists, encouraged by the Lenine-Trotsky-Rosa Luxemburg-Liebknecht groups, are determined to be more bold in their anti-patriotic and irreligious attitudes than ever before. Meanwhile, the encouragement that Washington has given the Spargo, Simons, Walling groups of paler Reds has given added prestige to Socialist views within our so-called liberal classes that make for a public opinion in contradiction to those basic principles laid down by the forefathers of our country for the liberty and security of human freedom.

Boston.

DAVID GOLDSTEIN.

German Colonial Rule

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Writes Dr. Ryan in AMERICA for November 23: "German colonial rule has been an unmitigated curse to the natives."

Writes H. A. Gibbons, who has made a thorough study of the whole African colonization scheme, and who was correspondent of the New York Herald with General Sir John Maxwell in the Egyptian campaign, being given special opportunities by him and by the Khedive for his work, as follows:

One has only to read the newspapers and reviews, and to look over book lists, and to go through parliamentary debates during the past fifteen years, to realize that only in Great Britain, among all the European colonizing powers, has there been manifested as much humanitarianism and idealism as in Germany with regard to the establishment and maintenance of a just and enlightened colonial régime (p. 241).

Aside from what they accomplished in the matter of sanitation and the spread of the knowledge of preventive medicine, the most remarkable achievement of the Germans in West Africa was their school system. Although Kamerun had hardly more than half the area of its neighbor, Nigeria, and one-seventh of the population, its government and assisted schools in 1913 were proportionately better attended than those of the British protectorate. Similarly Togoland had better school opportunities than its French and British neighbors (p. 311).

The ability of German officers in Kamerun and East Africa to command the loyalty of their native troops and the co-operation of the inhabitants of these two colonies are a big surprise to France and Great Britain, and disprove the thesis that the natives of the portions of Africa over which Germany ruled were eager to welcome British and French liberators (p. 480).

There is much to condemn in German methods of colonization in Africa. But there is no more to condemn in German methods than in French and Italian, and not as much as in Belgian (p. 175; "The New Map of Africa").

When authorities like Dr. Ryan and H. A. Gibbons differ so widely and so violently, where is the bewildered layman to look for the truth on this burning question of colonies? For it may prove to be one of the main bones of contention in the coming peace conference.

Moline, Ill.

J. B. CULMAN.

German Philosophy in Colleges

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Apropos of the very good article by Father Brickel in the is-

sue of AMERICA for November 16, I may say, for my own university at least, that the statement that "nearly every non-Catholic college and university in this country had courses in philosophy that might fairly be labeled 'Made in Germany,'" is certainly true. During my course in philosophy, completed two years ago, I cannot remember a single course which might not have been so labeled.

And now that the discredited German philosophy is to be discarded, fundamental changes will have to take place, because, though it may seem a sweeping assertion, the professors under whom I studied, as far as I could make out, knew very little about any other than German philosophy. And what they do not know, of course, they cannot impart. I remember one lecturer in the history of philosophy course, remarking when he came to the Middle Ages, that he would spend very little time on it as there was "not much in it." After having spent a semester on the philosophy of Greece and Rome, he proceeded to give two lectures on scholasticism; which I recognized as taken from a booklet by Father Rickaby. I doubt very much whether he knew anything more about the subject.

It seems to me, therefore, that if students in non-Catholic colleges could in some way be exposed to scholastic philosophy, they would have a higher opinion of it. As it is they obtain the impression that there is "not much in it." Father Brickel says, "Reason and the logic of events accomplished, rather than any bias toward Catholicism ought to usher in a renaissance of scholasticism." A chance to accomplish this result can only come by providing in some way for chairs of scholastic philosophy in non-Catholic colleges; because there appears to be, not so much an antipathy to, but a general ignorance of, scholasticism in non-Catholic colleges and universities.

Oakland.

P. C.

Fair Play

To the Editor of AMERICA:

In a communication, signed Frank J. Atkins, in AMERICA for November 23, it is stated that "an unfair and undeserved advantage" accrues to the Knights of Columbus over the Y. M. C. A. The advantage acquired is popularity with the soldiers, and the reason for this popularity is that the K. of C. give everything free of cost to the soldiers, while the Y. M. C. A. charges for similar articles. It is this reason that, in the mind of Mr. Atkins, makes the advantage for the K. of C. "unfair and undeserved."

By the same logic, if the Y. M. C. A. were to charge three or four times the value of things, the K. of C. would have to emulate their extortion and profiteering, to avoid the reproaches of Mr. Atkins and those who think with him that economy, self-sacrifice, generosity and patriotism give the K. of C. "an unfair and undeserved advantage" over the Y. M. C. A.

Since when has it become unfair for a man to be generous? Even a corporation or society may win the admiration of mankind by generosity and self-forgetfulness.

And is it not a little presumptuous for Mr. Atkins to pass judgment on the deserts of the K. of C.? If the esteem of men is the natural reward of good deeds, how can Mr. Atkins say that the favor found with the soldiers by the K. of C. on account of their good deeds is not deserved? Or will Mr. Atkins say that liberality is a vice and not a virtue? Or will he claim that not the nobler standard of action, but the lower, is to be set up as the norm of conduct?

If neither party is to have any advantage, material or moral, over the other, then let the Y. M. C. A. take instead of fifty-eight per cent. of the \$250,000,000 contributed by the American people, only an equal share with the other societies, and divide equally amongst them its property and resources. This request would be no more impertinent than Mr. Atkins' proposal.

Kansas City, Mo.

J. P.

A M E R I C A

A·CATHOLIC·REVIEW·OF·THE·WEEK

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 7, 1918

Entered as second-class matter, April 15th, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3d, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 20, 1918.

Published weekly by the America Press, New York.
President, RICHARD H. TIERNEY; Secretary, JOSEPH HUSSLEIN;
Treasurer, FRANCIS A. BREEN

SUBSCRIPTIONS, POSTPAID:
United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$3.00
Canada, \$3.50 Europe, \$4.00

Address:
THE AMERICA PRESS, 173 East 83d Street, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.
CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW
Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

The Pope and the Peace Conference

THE Peace Conference will soon begin, and there is no word about the Pope in connection therewith. Nobody is surprised at this, for the temper of many of the conferees is well known, and the famous Fifteenth Article of the secret treaty is still fresh in the minds of thoughtful men. His Holiness, therefore, will probably not be represented in Paris; and this is a calamity. True, he will lose nothing except some unstable prestige, but the world will be deprived of a benefit great beyond measure. In the first place, the Conference will need intimate, accurate knowledge of many strange peoples about to be erected into sovereign States. Not this alone, but there will be need too of ready, impartial information about the attitude of their former masters toward these people. Who better able to furnish this knowledge than the Papal Secretary of State? In time of peace his office is a clearing house, as it were, for the diplomacy of the world; in time of war, especially of this war, it is the only office where uncolored information of all the struggling nations can be had. During the past four years Papal delegates went freely into many of the afflicted countries: Bishops and other prelates traveled in turn from these nations to Rome and documents passed and repassed without hindrance. The Holy See, in short, is the only reliable depository of information concerning all the great events of the conflict. Is this necessary knowledge to be lost to the Conference?

More than that, the peace table should have the confidence of the world. It will get this and hold it, only when and in the measure that nations are convinced of the impartial justice of the conferees. And, sad to say, not all the peoples concerned are persuaded of the impartiality of the present master nations. The Poles, for instance, are skeptical of fairness to their claims and, truth to tell, their misgivings are not ungrounded. The presence of a Papal delegate in Paris would remove the fears of some and give an added guarantee to others that justice, not greed or spite, had been set up by the Conference as the norm of action. During all the terrible conflict, the Papacy has been the greatest moral force

in the world. Condemning false principles and atrocities, it yet retained the friendship of the conflicting nations and spent itself in the interests of all the suffering people, in a way unparalleled in the world's history. Hence, despite the vulgar clamor against him, the Pope has the confidence of the world, especially of that immense portion of it which is now emerging from autocracy into democracy, Catholic all or nearly all. No other power, not even the United States, enjoys this confidence. Is the Papacy's influence to be lost to Paris?

But there is a still more serious aspect of this problem. Millions of Catholic people have just been released from bondage and are about to begin life under a republican form of government. For many a long year these folk have borne the yoke and gyves and have eaten the bitter bread of thralldom. As a consequence, their characters have been warped a bit. Lovable in many ways, they are highly emotional withal and suspicious of one another. In the heyday of new-found freedom emotions and suspicions will need a check, else trouble will follow trouble. Whence the check? From the "brotherhood of man"? Phrases never yet stopped a rising passion, and the recent war has taught us that the brotherhood of man is but a phrase, a catchword. Besides, to aim at philanthropy only, is to miss the target. Ladies who strive to benefit man for only man's sake end by erecting hospitals for outcast cats; men who strive to benefit man for only man's sake end by slaughtering their fellows, as witness Russia. The brotherhood of man has been the watchword of the International from the beginning, and the grossest crimes have been committed in its name.

Whence the check? From religion only, from that religion which Czecho-Slovaks and Jugo-Slavs and Poles and Lithuanians know and love, the religion of which the Pope is the visible head. Is the influence of this religion to be lost to Paris? Apparently it is. Yet the Pope's voice is the only voice that falls with entire comfort on the ears of these peoples. He is the only person in the whole world who can calm their insurgent fears and guide their footsteps into the ways of righteous progress. The nations are making a grave mistake in excluding his Holiness from their deliberations. May they not have another Congress of Vienna?

Jim and Mike Cassidy

WHEN the blessed Francis was told by the physician "Father, according to our medicine-craft thine infirmity is incurable," he was filled with great joy, "hearing that Sister Death threatened him so nearly." "Call to me Brother Angelo and Brother Leo," he bade the weeping brethren, "that they may sing to me of my Sister Death." But these two dearly loved brethren coming in, sang to him with many tears, the "Song of Brother Sun" and of the other created things which glorify the Lord, and before the last verse of the canticle, Francis "added some verses of Sister Death," saying "Welcome Sister Death" and

Be thou praised, my Lord, of our Sister, Bodily Death, from whom no man living may escape;

Wo to those that die in mortal sin.

Blessed are they who are found in Thy most holy Will, for the second death shall not work them evil.

Praise ye and bless ye my Lord, and give Him thanks, and serve Him with great humility.

Nearly 700 years after Francis had departed to his heavenly country the Americans came into that earthly country from which he took his name, to do battle for justice. On that awful day when the Hindenburg line was rolled back, they fell like the leaves before the autumn blast on Mount Alverno, and with the fallen were Jim and Mike. Jim died in his brother's arms, and Mike, after writing to his father the touching story of a Catholic soldier's death passed to where beyond these voices there is peace.

He was out in front the whole time, and never stopped for shelter. I saw him throughout this terrible morning, and he knew no fear. He went to Mass and Holy Communion the day before; he always lived a clean life, and I never knew him to be anything but a good, straight fellow, so of course he is in heaven. It is for the best; it was God's will that took him.

The parallel is not forced. Francis, the Saint, Jim and Mike Cassidy, the Catholic soldiers were alike sustained in life and comforted in death by the infinitely tender mercy of Our Saviour vouchsafed in the Sacraments. The simple confidence that made St. Francis welcome his Sister Death was in the heart of the Catholic boy who died gloriously for his country, and of the Catholic boy who, before God called him, wrote to assuage the sorrow of his father "It is for the best; it was God's will that took him." The horror of war is that it mows down in the first rank of heroes just such young men as Jim and Mike Cassidy. Yet, as Mike wrote, "It is for the best," and we can only bow our heads and trust in Him who doth all things well.

Catholics at the Polls

THE smoke of the political battle of 1918 has cleared away, and Massachusetts has adopted a constitutional clause which will encourage a growing and healthy sentiment in this country. Henceforth in that venerable commonwealth, the duly qualified voter may not glance at the sky and decide that the pelting rain excuses him from going to the polls. Unless provided with a legal exemption, he must don whatever protection against the elements is at hand, and fare forth through the winding ways of Boston or the bucolic paths of Agawam to his proper polling place. Surely, the old days when "good citizens" regarded an election as little more than a display of "vulgar politics" are counted with the distant past. The city of New York recently witnessed the novel sight of Sisters of Mercy at the polls. Yet it is not surprising that our Sisters, who exemplify the highest religious culture of their sex, should also set the example of civic virtue to our Catholic women. To many of these gentle ladies, whose days are spent in prisons,

orphanages and schools, the very thought of voting was at first repugnant, and it was only a sense of duty that induced them to exercise the recently conferred suffrage.

The new Massachusetts enactment embodies the sound political principle, well grasped by these pioneer Sisters, that in a republic every citizen is part of the Government, and that the franchise is, therefore, a duty to be performed, rather than a right to be invoked at will, or a mere privilege to be omitted at pleasure. It cannot be too often repeated in these days of changing ideals, that ours is a Government of laws and constitutions, not of men. We have no kings, and, properly speaking the word "ruler" has no place in our political vocabulary. Only in a broad and analogous sense may our presidents and governors be called "rulers," for in name and in law, they are merely "executives," holding no more constitutional power to enact laws or interpret them, than is possessed by the humblest citizen. In the end, it is the citizen who makes the American State what it is, a power for good, encouraging education and fostering religion, or an instrument of evil. He it is who by his vote, is responsible for the conduct of the executive, the legislative, and in some States, of the judicial functions of government. With his fellow-electors, he constitutes a fourth function of government, as indispensable as the traditional three. It is his duty, therefore, so to use his vote that the affairs of the State will be placed in the hands of fearless executives, wise lawmakers and impartial judges.

There was a time in this country when the infamous creed promulgated by a "notorious malefactor of great wealth," that any man was a fool who served on a jury, enlisted in the militia, or cast a vote, was too commonly accepted. Happily the day now seems dawning on a just appraisal and acceptance of civic duties. To fail to vote, or to vote corruptly, is an easy and excellent way to replace free and representative government by tyranny, and to make void those great achievements for which our fathers died. Catholics in particular should evince a jealous concern for the maintenance of civic righteousness, for nowhere has the Church so flourished, as under the guidance of American political ideals. As Catholics and as citizens, it is our plain duty to preserve those ideals unimpaired, as a blessing to the generations to come after our little day has been forgotten.

Our Lady of Victory

IN the beautiful language of mysticism and metaphor which the Church delights to use when invoking Our Lady's intercession she is twice called a "tower"—the "Tower of David" and the "Tower of Ivory"—the first title signifying her invincible power, and the second her incomparable purity. She is a strong and lofty fortress, "built with bulwarks," "a thousand bucklers hang upon it, all the armor of valiant men." "Terrible as an army set in array" is another mystical description of Mary's strength, and words addressed in Holy Writ

to Judith, that valiant woman of the Old Testament whose courage delivered her people from the bondage that menaced them, are also applied with singular felicity to the peerless Maiden who crushed the serpent's head:

The Lord hath blessed thee by his power, because by thee He hath brought our enemies to naught. . . . Blessed art thou, O daughter, by the Lord, the most high God, above all women upon the earth. . . . Because He hath so magnified thy name this day, that thy name shall not depart out of the mouth of men who shall be mindful of the power of the Lord forever, for that thou hast not spared thy life, by reason of the distress and tribulation of thy people, but hast prevented our ruin in the presence of our God.

But Our Lady is not only an impregnable tower of defense, the Tower of David, her conquering royal ancestor, but she is equally strong within. In offensive warfare Mary is also invincible owing to her unstained purity. Sin's banner never waved over that fortress. Therefore she is called the Tower of Ivory. "There is no spot in her," she is like a "garden enclosed," a "fountain sealed up" or a "lily among thorns." "No defiled thing cometh unto her. For she is the brightness of eternal light and the unspotted mirror of God's majesty and the image of his goodness."

What wonder is it then if the country privileged to have as its national Patroness the pure and valiant Woman described in the beautiful language just quoted should have been Providentially destined, by its whole-hearted entrance into the great war, to bring the dreadful conflict to a swift and victorious end? A large proportion of our bravest soldiers and sailors are proud to call themselves Our Lady's children and who can doubt that it was she who in the hour of battle won a spirit of irresistible courage for every American warrior. And now that peace has come it will be this Maiden-Mother's example and protection, let us hope, that will enable our armies to return to the tranquillity of civil life with honor unstained and manhood unsullied.

The Bolsheviks in New York

THE Bolsheviks have come to town. There is difficulty, however, in stating precisely whether they are mostly found among the Socialists and I. W. W., or among those soldiers and sailors who now hang about New York, boasting of wounds that were never inflicted, and of parlous battles fought 5,000 miles from their immediate vicinity. It would be an error to attach too much importance to the riots and near-riots, which attended and followed the International Socialists' meeting at Madison Square Garden on the night of November 25. Yet it must be admitted that the premium for proficiency in the gentle arts of the Bolsheviks must be awarded to the soldiers and sailors, rather than to the misguided multitudes who had assembled to listen to the sophism of Scott Nearing, and the ravings of that eminent Socialist jurist, Judge Jacob Pankin.

Fault there was on both sides, and the only factors to emerge with credit from the conflict were the New

York police. The Socialists claim that neither Congress nor the State of New York may abridge the right of the people to assemble peaceably to petition a redress of grievances, and no sane American advances any proposition to the contrary. But unless we are to have mobs on every corner, we must allow that the whole point at issue is found in the word "peaceably." It ought to be clear that an assemblage in which Socialist leaders—some of whom, as men of intelligence, must know better—openly express their sympathy with the loot and rapine of the Bolsheviks at the very time when these savages are up in arms against our troops in Russia; and worse, urge their hearers to plan for a similar revolution in this country, cannot be called "peaceable." It is nothing short of an open invitation to riot and sedition; and the very Socialists who, after wildly applauding these proposals in the police-guarded precincts of Madison Square Garden, forthwith demanded the protection of the State which they had reviled, against the Bolsheviks outside the building, must feel this truth, even if they will not admit it.

But for all this, the conduct of the soldiers and sailors who lay in wait to strip half-frenzied Socialist women of their red badges and to bring the sterner members of the fraternity to their senses by kicks and blows, sometimes inflicted after the unhappy advocates of Bolshevik methods had been chased for blocks through New York's midnight streets, calls for summary prosecution by the military authorities. There can be no doubt that the vast majority of our soldiers and sailors, peaceful, law-abiding citizens who donned the uniform not because they loved war but because they loved their country, are heartily ashamed of the men who did all they could to disgrace the flag on the night of November 25. It is the plain duty of the military commanders to protect the good name of the real American citizen-soldiers, by taking such measures as will prevent a repetition of similar disgraceful scenes. It is pleasant to record, however, that the majesty of the law was admirably upheld by the New York police, who with calm impartiality and final efficiency, suppressed both rioting soldiers and ranting Socialists. "I don't love these Socialists," said a sturdy guardian of the peace, "and I hates to hit a soldier. But I'm goin' to hit 'im and hit 'im hard, if he don't behave." For their bearing in exceedingly trying circumstances, the New York police, too often the butt of the malicious and the unthinking, deserve the hearty thanks, not only of the erstwhile valiant Socialists whom they rescued from the soldiers, but of the public at large.

The Government in Strange Fields

IT may be that even with Mr. Creel at one end of the cable and Mr. Burleson at the other the people of the United States will read nothing but uncensored news during the negotiations at Versailles. Mr. Burleson has lately deplored the shortcomings of the cable service,

stating in fact, that one cable was so unpatriotic as to develop a distressing case of malingering some weeks ago, at the very time its best war service was most needed. If Mr. Burleson thinks he can minister to the cable's psychic ills by bringing it within the magic circle of governmental control, he deserves the thanks of the country, but a certain degree of doubt may be cast both upon his ability and upon his intentions.

We are surely fallen upon strange times. When war came to us, Congress willingly conceded large and unusual powers to the Government. To that proceeding there was no serious objection. So far from regretting the step, there were many who wondered, as the war dragged on, why the Government did not use them more vigorously. But the war according to the President's message to Congress is now over, and it would seem, therefore, that the vast powers granted for the emergency might be safely retrenched. But precisely the opposite is urged. If certain minor officials, made unsteady by the heady wine of unaccustomed greatness, are allowed to have their way, some of these powers are not only to be enlarged but made permanent. Mr. J. Hamilton Lewis, who by invitation of the people of Illinois will shortly retire from the Senate, sponsors a resolution in that body to the effect that "the policy of the United States Government for the future should be that of Government ownership of interstate railroads, telegraphs, telephones, and also national lines of communication necessary to complete postal and telegraph service to the citizens of the nation." The Senate received the resolution with silence and its wonted urbanity, but within a few days Mr. Burleson proceeded,

against the vigorous protest of the owners, to put the cable and the Postal Telegraph under Government administration.

We therefore face this situation: the Government now controls all the ordinary means of newsgathering and intercommunication, namely, the telegraph, the telephone, the cables, the wireless, the express companies, the railroads, and, of course, the mail service. Worse, a powerful faction at Washington proposes to make this condition, which the American people allowed only as a war-measure, permanent. There can be few more hurtful things in a republic than a press censored or controlled by the Government, but with the Government in control of the wires, censorship will follow almost as a matter of course. It is well known that a certain magazine, with whose purposes AMERICA has no particular sympathy, was excluded from the mails simply because a Government official did not "like its general tone." Are we ready to admit a time in this country when a citizen can be legally forbidden to use the telephone, the telegraph, the cable, or any other means of communication which may be necessary for the proper expression of his opinions and beliefs, simply because these opinions and beliefs are disapproved, as to their "general tone," by the Government?

If we are, then we had better delete certain telling phrases from the Federal Constitution, and prepare for the day when Papal letters are promulgated only by permission of the Postmaster General, and Catholic writers submit their defense of the Faith to Hardshell Baptists and sneering atheists gathered in some musty office at Washington.

Literature

WHY NOT A BOOK THEN?

ONCE upon a time there lived a rich and benevolent bachelor who had seven nieces. Wishing to have them grow up lovers of good books, every Christmas he made each of the girls a present of a literary masterpiece. Out of a desire moreover to foster in his young relatives an ever-increasing appreciation of the world's great literary works, he adopted the expedient of making the cost of each present correspond with the age of the recipient. The amiable uncle's one-year-old niece, for example, was given a one-dollar book, her three-year-old sister a three-dollar one, the budding maiden of seventeen a work costing seventeen entire dollars and so on. As our eccentric bachelor lived to be very old and remained until his death a man of ample means, each of his seven fortunate nieces eventually owned so select and expensive a collection of books that her library was itself a dowry. Unfortunately however the well-merited reputation for learning and cleverness that the seven maidens' fine library won for them frightened all suitors away, for the imperfectly educated young men of their circle had not the courage to marry such paragons of culture and erudition as the rich old bachelor's seven nieces eventually became. So they all died unwedded, but full of contentment and learning, passing in chronological order to a better life at the ages of 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98 and 99 respectively. Their valuable library they bequeathed to their only brother's seven frivolous daughters. Warned by their aunt's fate, however, this new generation of

nieces never opened a single volume of the legacy they received, but married early for pure love and brought up large families of boys.

But let none of this article's readers fear, like the rich bachelor, that they can in conscience choose nothing but highly improving books as Christmas presents for their kith and kin. It must be owned nevertheless that the world of books does offer the perplexed holiday-shopper first-aid of a gratifyingly prompt and effective character. For all she requires is a good book-list to select her purchases from, as the age, character, profession or hobby of each relative or friend who must be remembered at Christmas time will at once suggest what books to buy. Those who have carefully read during the past year AMERICA's "Literature" department have doubtless found reviewed in it many a book that would make a suitable gift. Just to recall some of them:

The usefulness of a priest's library would certainly be increased by the addition of such volumes as Father O'Neill's "Sacerdotal Safeguards" (Notre Dame Press, \$1.50), Bishop Ward's "The Priestly Vocation" (Longmans, \$1.75), Father Sasia's "The Future Life" (Benziger, \$2.50), Father Hurter's "Eight Days' Retreat" (Herder, \$1.25), Dr. Coffey's "Epistemology" (Longmans, \$7.50), Father Callan's commentary on "The Four Gospels" (Wagner, \$4.00), Cardinal Mercier's "Origins of Contemporary Psychology" (Kenedy, \$2.25), and his "Manual of Modern Scholastic Philosophy" (Herder, \$3.50).

In some of the foregoing volumes the educated layman will also be interested, no doubt, and both pastor and parishioner may recall favorable reviews that appeared of such works on asceticism and apologetics as Mgr. Gibier's "Religion" (Téqui, 3 fr. 50), Father Robison's "Christ's Masterpiece" and "His Only Son" (Herder, \$1.25 each), Borsi's "A Soldier's Confidences with God" (Kenedy, \$1.00), Father Labauche's "God and Man" (Kenedy, \$1.75), and Father Toohey's "Logic" (Schwartz, Kirwin & Fauss, \$1.00).

Those who are choosing presents for men or women fond of history and biography will find awaiting them a particularly attractive list of works. To name some of them: "The Correspondence of John Henry Newman, 1839-1845" (Longmans, \$4.50), Ronald Knox's "A Spiritual Aeneid" (Longmans, \$2.50), "The Education of Henry Adams" (Houghton Mifflin, \$5.00), M. Bordeaux's "Georges Guynemer" (Yale Press, \$1.60), Mrs. Harris's "The Life and Letters of Joel Chandler Harris" (Houghton Mifflin, \$3.00), Sidney Colvin's "John Keats" (Scribner, \$4.50), Elizabeth Kite's "Beaumarchais" (Badger, \$5.00), Father Kane's "Memoir of William M. Stanton, S.J." (Herder, \$1.25), Williams' "The High Romance" (Macmillan, \$1.60), Aksakoff's "A Russian Gentleman" (Longmans, \$2.25), Cram's "The Great Thousand Years" and his "Substance of Gothic" (Marshall, Jones, \$1.00 and \$1.50), Haring's "Trade and Navigation between Spain and the Indies" (Macmillan, \$2.25), Ferrero's "Europe's Fatal Hour" (Dodd, Mead, \$2.00), Hayes' "A Political and Social History of Modern Europe" (Macmillan, \$4.50), Father Hughes' "History of the Society of Jesus in North America" (Longmans, \$8.00), Kurth's "The Church at the Turning Points of History" (Rev. Victor Day, Helena, Mont., \$1.25), Schapiro's "Modern and Contemporary European History" (Houghton Mifflin, \$3.50), Father Blunt's "Great Wives and Mothers" (Devin-Adair, \$2.00), and Merriman's "The Rise of the Spanish Empire" (Macmillan, \$7.50).

Readers of poetry and of pure literature are offered an exceptionally appetizing menu this season for we have Sergeant Kilmer's Catholic anthology, "Dreams and Images" (Boni & Liveright, \$1.60), Theodosia Garrison's "The Dreamers" (Doran, \$1.25), John Drinkwater's "Poems" (Dodd, Mead, \$1.25), Theodore Maynard's two volumes, "Drums of Defeat" and "Folly" (Erskine MacDonald), Helen Parry Eden's "Coal and Candlelight" (Lane, \$1.25), Miss Widdemer's "The Old Road to Paradise" (Holt, \$1.25), Mr. Thomas Walsh's "Gardens Overseas" (Lane, \$1.25), Francis Carlin's "My Ireland" (Holt, \$1.25), Alice Meynell's "A Father of Women" (Scribner, \$0.70), Father Blackmore's "The Riddle of Hamlet" (Stratford Co., \$2.00), Professor Sherman's "On Contemporary Literature" (Holt, \$1.50), Alice Meynell's "Hearts of Controversy" (Scribner, \$1.75), "Collected Works of Padraic Pearse" (Stokes, \$3.00), Wilfrid Ward's "Last Lectures" (Longmans, \$4.00), Mrs. O'Connor's "Herself—Ireland" (Dodd, Mead, \$2.50), Holliday's "Walking-stick Papers" (Doran, \$1.50), Fabre's "The Wonders of Instinct" and his "Our Humble Helpers" (Century, \$3.00 and \$2.00), Woodberry's "Hawthorne" (Bobbs-Merrill, \$1.50), Gissing's "The Private Papers of Henry Ryecroft" (Boni & Liveright, \$0.60), and De la Mare's "Motley and Other Poems" (Holt, \$1.25).

As the year has produced a large harvest of excellent war books, those who are still interested in the subject will find abundant reading matter in such works as Belmont's "A Crusader in France" (Dutton, \$1.50), Le Roux's "On the Field of Honor" (Houghton Mifflin, \$1.50), Redier's "Comrades in Courage" (Doubleday, \$1.40), Connolly's "The U-Boat Hunters" (Scribner, \$1.50), Gibb's "From Bapaume to Passchendale" (Doran, \$2.50), Monlaur's "Sister Clare" (McBride, \$1.25), Azan's "The Warfare of Today" (Houghton Mifflin, \$2.50), Tiplady's "The Cross at the Front" (Revell, \$1.00), Lauder's "A Minstrel in France" (Hearst, \$2.00), Hall's "High Adven-

ture" (Houghton Mifflin, \$1.50), "Y's" "Odyssey of a Torpedoed Transport" (Houghton Mifflin, \$1.25), Boucier's "Under the German Shells" (Scribner, \$1.50), Lauzanne's "Fighting France" (Appleton, \$1.50), and Dr. Barry's "The World's Debate" (Doran, \$1.50).

To lovers of fiction the year does not seem to offer so wide a field of choice as usual, but there is Isabel Clarke's "Children of Eve" (Benziger, \$1.35), Tarkington's "The Magnificent Ambersons" (Doubleday, \$1.40), Marcelle Tinayre's "To Arms!" (Dutton, \$1.50), E. F. Benson's "An Autumn Sowing" (Doran, \$1.50), Marshall's "The Grafton's" (Dodd, \$1.50), Ayscough's "Jacqueline" (Kenedy, \$1.50), Locke's "The Rough Road" (Lane, \$1.50), Vachell's "The Soul of Susan Yellam" (Doran, \$1.50), and Dorothy Canfield's "Home Fires in France" (Holt, \$1.25).

As Christmas is of course in a special way the children's festival, the publishers have taken care that our boys and girls shall not suffer from a lack of suitable gift books. The day would end however, before we could name them all. A number of them will be found noticed in other columns of this issue. Those however who have made it a rule never to read, much less to purchase, any book less than a year old will perhaps disapprove of the foregoing attempts to help the distressed Christmas shopper and will advise her not to squander her means on this ephemeral literature born during the war but to go back to the Elizabethans and Victorians for her holiday gifts. That counsel is of course no less sound than familiar and many, no doubt, can follow it with profit. But experience proves that few will read an old book, however good it is, when they can lay hands on a new one instead. So it is the duty of a wise purchaser to provide her prospective Christmas beneficiaries with selections from the best of the past year's literary output and with new editions of the good old books as well. This issue of AMERICA mentions or notices on some of its other pages many volumes, besides those named above, our Christmas-book number of preceding years may suggest additional titles, and the list of books for Catholic readers which Father Reville has been contributing to the *Catholic Mind* during the past eleven months may offer further aid to the perplexed. If friends and relatives only use their imagination intelligently both Molly and Tom should receive as a Christmas present "just the book they wanted."

WALTER DWIGHT, S.J.

THE CROWN

She had twelve stars for diadem,
She had for footstool the full moon,
Her quiet eyes out-shining them
Kept memories of the night and noon
And the still morns at Nazareth
When in her arms the Child drew breath.

So safe, so warm, he slept by her
In her enfolding arms at peace,
Her milky babe, little and dear;
And yet the Tree that should be His
Grew in the forest, wide and high,
Whose branches should fill all the sky.

He made twelve stars into her crown
And set the moon beyond her feet;
He was King in Jerusalem Town
With twelve spines for His coronet
To pierce the brain, the blood and bone
That thought of man's Redemption.

O, when she answered Gabriel
With "Be it done!" could she foresee
The high pangs, that she took as well
With Bethlehem, should be Calvary,

Or was that name of high bliss
Born with sharp pains, fierce agonies?
Hath she beneath her crown of stars
Remembrance of the thorns wherewith
Her people crowned her Son? What scars
Redder than roses in a wreath
Doth she wear in a coronal
Under the lights that rise and fall?

KATHARINE TYNAN.

REVIEWS

The World Problem. Capital, Labor and the Church. By JOSEPH HUSSLEIN, S.J., Associate Editor of AMERICA. New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons and America Press. \$1.25.

The publication of the present book could not have been more happily timed. It appears Providentially at the very moment when an intelligent understanding of the great social problem is imperatively demanded. No one can be indifferent in so vital a matter. Amid the welter of literature upon this subject we have long looked for a complete and authoritative treatment, such as is here offered us. There is no important phase of the question of capital and labor, or of the attitude of the Church towards both, that is not discussed by the author in a popular, scientific and interesting way. Still greater authority is given to his statements by frequent and pithy quotations from the Labor Encyclicals of Pope Leo XIII.

The book is entirely constructive and will serve as the basis of a Catholic social program. All the various social measures and reconstructive plans are submitted to consideration, and approved or rejected in the light of right reason and of Catholic teaching and tradition. It is not the purpose of the Church to propose a detailed social program to which every Catholic should subscribe. On many questions there will be as many opinions as there are minds capable of forming an independent judgment. On the other hand, there are measures on which Catholics, understanding the existing conditions and following the guidance of their holy Faith, cannot differ. Everyone is in duty bound to contribute his share towards forming a correct public opinion and casting an intelligent vote where the ballot is granted him. On our solution of the social question depends not merely the temporal happiness and prosperity, but the spiritual welfare of our nation. On all these questions Father Husslein will be found a safe guide, and the reading of his book will prove a social education to our Catholic people. It cannot therefore be too earnestly recommended by priests and teachers and those in authority, and will prove invaluable in the classroom.

An idea of the subjects discussed may be gathered from the inclusion of such topics as capitalism, Socialism, labor unionism, I. W. W. strikes, the closed shop, unemployment, government control and ownership, cooperation, democratic control of industries, the minimum wage, the State and property, the woman laborer, etc. These and countless similar themes are treated in a thorough and sympathetic manner that will appeal alike to "the man in the street" and the scientific student. An exhaustive index renders the book doubly valuable for private reference, for the pulpit and the classroom. It should be in the hands of every reader and will prove a valuable Christmas gift for Catholics and non-Catholics alike.

M. L. T.

The Boy Who Knew What the Birds Said. By PADRAIC COLUM. Illustrated by DUGALD STEWART WALKER. \$1.50. **English Fairy Tales.** Retold by FLORA ANNIE STEEL. \$2.50. **Every Child's Mother Goose.** With an Introduction by CAROLYN WELLS. Pictured by EDITH R. WILSON. \$2.00. New York: The Macmillan Company.

The Spanish Fairy Book. (*Cuentos de Hadas*). By GERTRUDIS SEGOVIA. Translated by ELIZABETH VERNON QUINN. With Eight Illustrations in Color by GEORGE W. HOOD. New York: Frederick A. Stokes Company. \$1.50.

The Book of Elves and Fairies. For Story-Telling and Reading Aloud and for the Children's Own Reading. By FRANCES JENKINS OLCOTT. With Illustrations by MILO WINTER. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., \$2.00.

Notwithstanding the restrictions the late war put on publishing, there seems to be no lack of attractive Christmas books for the children. Mr. Colum's unusual book, which Dugald Walker has happily illustrated, is based upon Irish folklore, and the characters employ Celtic terms of expression. There seems to be no doubt about the fact that when the bird that follows the cuckoo flies into the cuckoo's mouth, the world was to come to an end. But a little boy prevented that inconvenient event from taking place by very adroitly covering with his cap the cuckoo's mouth just as the pursuing bird was about to fly into it. Then the birds of the king's garden were so grateful to the lad for averting the catastrophe that the crow was deputed to teach him the birds' language. Thereafter when he heard them talking he had but to listen in order to learn how Feet-in-the-Ashes discovered the stone of victory, how Bloom-of-Youth outwitted the Witch of the Elders just in the nick of time, how the craft of the Cook's Son was laid bare, and many another marvel.

"English Fairy Tales" is the most sumptuous of the books named above. Arthur Rackham's fine illustrations in color will long be stored in the memory of the children who see them, and Flora Annie Steel's way of retelling such old favorites as "St. George of Merrie England," "Jack the Giant-Killer," "The Three Little Pigs," "Dick Whittington," "Henny Penny" and nearly forty other tales is after the time-honored fashion. The moving story of "The Babes in the Wood" is told in verse, with the apposite moral for wicked executors appended. "Every Child's Mother Goose" contains, besides the more familiar rhymes, many others which that eighteenth-century dame, whoever she was, certainly never heard of. Edith Wilson's colored illustrations are made from dolls.

"The Spanish Fairy Book" contains eight rather long fairy tales of nine or ten chapters each, which Mr. Hood has appropriately illustrated. Little readers will doubtless learn with breathless interest how Starlita came back from the bottom of "The Blue Lake," what Gonzalita's "Magic Gifts" were, how Elena lost and recovered her "Tinkling Laugh," and what happened to "The Fairy and the Prince." The compiler of "The Book of Elves and Fairies" has gone to various countries for her stories, and some of the best come from Ireland. The most authoritative information regarding the habits, prejudices and predilections of all kinds of elves is given, the importance of filling little children's minds with fairy lore is emphasized and verses are mingled with the stories. Mr. Winter's four pictures in color show that he knows just what "the good people" look like.

W. D.

Historic Mackinac. The Historical, Picturesque and Legendary Features of the Mackinac Country. By EDWIN O. WOOD, LL.D. Two Volumes. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$12.50.

If every historic locality in our great country had as careful and painstaking a historian as Mackinac, what an easy task the compiler would have who essayed to put together a general record. After even a hasty glance at these two volumes of lavish detail one is forced to speculate whether there was any possible item of value that had escaped Dr. Wood's patient and diligent search. It is the irony of fate that he did not live to see them published. He began his work as a winter-evening recreation devoted to the collection of material relating to the history and romance of Mackinac Island, where he spent his summers. Gradually the accumulation extended into the greater field of the Old Northwest, the section first discovered and colonized by the French; the occasion of the final struggle for mastery between France and England on this side of the Atlantic, and the first Territory organized by Congress.

The first volume deals with the early history of the Mackinac country: the French explorers, Father Marquette, the *coureurs des bois*, the fur traders and the contending nationalities that followed them, an exceptional aggregation of rich and varied material. In the second there is placed at the command of the general reader, and in several instances in citations from books long out of print, a number of references, descriptions and narratives that visiting authors have set down about Mackinac, its charming scenery and romantic legends. More than one hundred and fifty illustrations and maps, an extensive bibliography and a very complete index round out the usefulness of these two interesting and valuable volumes. They are dedicated appropriately to the Right Rev. Mgr. F. A. O'Brien, who, as president and member of the Michigan Historical Society, has personally been long at work preserving the historical records of the Old Northwest and of Michigan, and whose cooperation the author was fortunate enough to enlist in the preparation of "Historic Mackinac."

T. F. M.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS

Franklin K. Matthews has packed into "The Boy Scouts' Year Book" such a wealth of interesting and informing matter that the volume ought to have a wide appeal. Stories, verses and pictures mingle with instructions about how to make a number of things boys are eager to possess. Naturally the military aspect of the Boy Scout organization is emphasized. Perhaps the beauty of modesty and humility should be stressed more, for the average boy who has mastered the contents of Mr. Matthews' book is in danger of vanity and bumpiousness.—"I Am an American" (Houghton Mifflin, \$1.25), by Sara Cone Bryant, is a good patriotic book for children of eight and upward. Our ideals, traditions and advantages are simply described, and the deeds of our heroes and statesmen are recounted.—"The Trail Book" (Houghton Mifflin, \$2.00) is Mary Austen's chronicle of what the Indians and animals in the natural history museum told two children about prehistoric wild-life and the adventures of our early red-skins. Most boys and girls would hardly be as attentive listeners as were Oliver and Dorcas Jane.—Howard R. Garis's latest juvenile is "The Venture Boys in Camp" (Harper, \$1.25), and he tells how three lads pass their vacation in the Onondaga Valley and with Indian Johnnie's help discover a valuable mica mine.—"Lest We Forget" (Silver, Burdett, \$0.75) is an excellent collection of stories of the world war, written for youthful readers by John Gilbert Thomas and Inez Bigwood. The great personages of the conflict, those who have impersonated the ideals of the Allies or who have given their lives that liberty might live, are sympathetically portrayed. King Albert of Belgium, Cardinal Mercier, Edith Cavell, Rupert Brooke, Captain Fryatt, Marshal Joffre, Marshal Foch, Alan Seeger, General Pershing and Raemaekers and their respective services in the cause of the Allies are sketched in simple but impressive language that will appeal to children. The remaining two-thirds of the book are devoted to battles, incidents and ideals.—The latest of Lucy Fitch Perkins' "Twin Series" is "The French Twins" (Houghton Mifflin, \$1.25), and it describes how little Pierre and Pierette lived in Rheims during the long bombardment. The author brings out well the people's Catholic faith.—Edith Barnard Delano's new story for girls is called "Two Alike" (Houghton Mifflin, \$1.35), and it tells how "Bunny" and "Bobs," twin sisters of seventeen, passed the summer on an old Maryland plantation and solved a mystery.

"The Prisoner of Love" (Benziger, \$1.25 to \$3.50), Father Lesance's latest prayer book, consists of two parts, the first being made up of a translation of the Abbé S. Febvre's work on "Our Duties Toward Jesus in the Most Holy Sacrament of the Altar," and the second part being chiefly composed of various prayers to Our Saviour in the Holy Eucharist.—The title page of "The Layfolks' Ritual" (Kenedy, \$1.10) thus describes in

red letters the contents and the character of the attractive little book: "The complete text in Latin and English of those Rites of the *Ordo Ministrandi Sacramenta* at which layfolk have common occasion to assist. Wheretof is added from the Pontifical the Rite of Confirmation and from the Missal the Order of Mass, the Nuptial Mass and the Masses of the dead. Edited by the Benedictine Monks of Farnborough Abbey in Hampshire, with introductions by the Right Reverend the Lord Abbot of the same." The last sixty pages of the book, the part on the Holy Sacrifice, are also printed separately (\$0.30).—Father James J. Duffy has edited an attractive rubricated edition of the "Manual of the Sodality of the Blessed Virgin Mary" (Peter Reilly, Philadelphia, \$0.50).

Those who like a good dog-story will find R. G. Kirke's two well-written tales of "Zanoza" (Knopf, \$0.75), a Russian wolfhound, as thrilling as could be desired.—"The Reclaimers" (Harper, \$1.50), by Margaret Hill McCarter, is a novel telling how "Jerry," an enterprising young woman from the East, chose to develop the farm she had inherited in the "sage brush country" of Kansas rather than live a life of ease and affluence at home. The farm yields her a husband, too.—"The Rule of Might" (Putnam, \$1.60), by J. A. Cramb, is a psychological study in contrast. Napoleon in Vienna in 1809 is contrasted with Heinrich von Rentzdorf, an Austrian poet-warrior. The action extends over three days and is quite negligible. Page after page is devoted to what might be called patho-psychology, the analysis of the brooding mind of Napoleon and of the Austrian poet with his vague Pantheistic creed. The Austrian is an ancient edition of the modern Mr. Wells, and the analysis of his morbid psychology shows us how little original thought there is in Wells. Philosophy, history, religion, art, literature and learned names fruitlessly pass before the reader's bewildered vision.

Father Garesché has gathered into two little volumes entitled "Your Interests Eternal" and "Your Soul's Salvation" (Benziger, \$0.75 each) a number of papers on practical piety and Catholic organization, which he originally wrote for the *Queen's Work*, as laymen's helps to holy living. The style of the essays is informal and familiar, and the matter deals with such topics as "Spiritual Reading," "The Spirit of Sacrifice," "On Saying the Beads" and "Teaching for God." He also has ready for the Christmas season, to comfort "War Mothers" (Benziger, \$0.65), an attractive little book of poems, several of which were first printed in AMERICA. Many of the stanzas are quite martial in character: these lines, for instance, from "To the Blessed Jeanne D'Arc":

Thou fair, brave maiden with the soul of fire,
Thou art undying now. Thy heart shall go
Leading in every charge and all thy ranks inspire.
For every great advance
There is a captain for the arms of France.

Those who mean to make little friends and relatives presents of books this year should not fail to examine the attractive series of children's books published by the P. F. Volland Co. of Chicago and sold for \$1.00 a volume. Among the titles recently brought out are "The Gigglequicks," whose deeds of fairy benevolence Miriam Clark Potter describes in verses and Tony Sarg in colors; the diverting adventures of "Sunny Bunny" are told by Nina Wilcox Putnam and sympathetically illustrated by Johnny Gruelle; "Come Play with Me" is a book of charming rhymes by Olive Beaupré Miller and appropriate pictures by Carmen L. Browne; "Myself and I" is Helen Van Valkenburgh and Maginel Wright Enright's joint contribution from the "Land of Let's Pretend." Dugald Stewart Walker has prepared

for small children a sumptuous book called "Dream Boats and Other Stories" (Doubleday, \$1.50), with colored and black-and-white portraits of "fauns, fairies, fishes and other pleasant creatures." Crowell has lately published new editions of Stevenson's perennially welcome "Child's Garden of Verses," and Edward Lear's "Book of Nonsense" with all the original limericks and drawings (\$0.50 each).

BOOKS RECEIVED

- D. Appleton & Co., New York:**
"Shavings." A Novel. By Joseph C. Lincoln. \$1.50
- Allyn & Bacon, Boston:**
Spoken Spanish. A Conversational Reader and Composition. By Edith J. Broomhall. \$0.60; Sans Famille. Par Hector Malot. Edited with Notes, Conversation and Composition Exercises, and Vocabulary. By Victor E. François, Ph.D., and Jacob Greenberg, A.M. \$0.80; An Inland Voyage and Travels with a Donkey. By Robert Louis Stevenson. Edited by James Cloyd Bowman, M.A. \$0.60.
- Gabriel Beauchesne, Paris:**
Correspondances du Siècle Dernier un Projet de Mariage du Duc D'Orléans (1836), Lettres de Léopold Ier de Belgique à Adolphe Thiers (1834-1864), Documents inédits publiés avec des Avertissements et des Notes. Par L. De Lanza de Laborie. 4 fr.
- Beckley-Cardy Co., Chicago:**
Father Thrift and His Animal Friends. By Joseph C. Sindelar. With Pictures by Helen Geraldine Hodge. \$0.50; Merry Christmas Entertainments: Recitations, Dialogues, Exercises, Plays, Drills, Motion Songs, Acrostics, Tableaux, Pantomimes, Games, Songs and Music. Edited by Joseph C. Sindelar. \$0.35.
- St. Benedict's College, Atchison, Kans.:**
The Chancellor Prize, a School Operetta in Three Acts for Men and Boys. By Rev. Andrew Green, O.S.R. Score and Libretto, \$1.25; Libretto, \$0.15.
- Benziger Brothers, New York:**
Outline Meditations. By Madame Cecilia. \$1.50; Alberta: Adventuress. By Pierre L'Ermite. \$1.50.
- Browne & Nolan, Lt., Dublin:**
Some Irish Vincentians in China in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries. By Rev. Patrick Boyle, C.M.
- The Century Co., New York:**
The Biology of War. By G. F. Nicolai. \$3.50.
- The Cornhill Co., Boston:**
Chamber Music. By James Joyce. \$1.00.
- Dodd, Mead & Co., New York:**
Dr. Adrian. By Louis Couperus. \$1.50; The Betrothal. A Sequel to the Blue Bird. A Fairy Play in Five Acts and Eleven Scenes. By Maurice Maeterlinck. Translated by Alexander T. de Mattos. \$1.50.
- George H. Doran Co., City:**
Understanding South America. By Clayton Sedgwick Cooper. Illustrated. \$2.00; Such Nonsense, An Anthology. By Carolyn Wells. \$2.00.
- E. P. Dutton & Co., New York:**
The Life of St. Francis Xavier, Evangelist, Explorer, Mystic. By Edith Anne Stewart. With Translations from His Letters by David MacDonald, B.D. \$6.00.
- Harper & Brothers, New York:**
The Seven Purposes, an Experience in Psychic Phenomena. By Margaret Cameron. \$2.00.
- B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis:**
A Manual of the History of Dogmas. Volume II. The Development of Dogmas During the Middle Ages and After. 896-1907. By Rev. Bernard J. Otten, S.J. \$2.50.
- Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston:**
From "Poilu" to "Yank." By William Yorke Stevenson. With Illustrations. \$1.50.
- Alfred A. Knopf, New York:**
Architecture and Democracy. By Claude Bragdon, F.A.I.A. \$2.00; The Madman, His Parables and Poems. By Kahlil Gibran. \$1.25.
- J. B. Lippincott Co., Philadelphia:**
By Eskimo Dog-sled and Kayak. A Description of a Missionary's Experiences and Adventures in Labrador. By S. K. Hutton, M.B., Ch.B.Vict. With Thirteen Illustrations and a Map. \$1.50; Clear the Decks! A Tale of the American Navy of Today. By "Commander." With Twenty Illustrations. \$1.50.
- Longmans Green & Co., New York:**
The Priestly Vocation: a Series of Fourteen Conferences Addressed to the Secular Clergy. By Right Rev. Bernard Ward, F.R.Hist.S. \$1.75.
- The Macmillan Co., New York:**
In the Heart of a Fool. By William Allen White. \$1.60; A History of Spain. Founded on the Historia de España y de la Civilización Española of Rafael Altamira. By Charles E. Chapman, Ph.D. \$2.60.
- Robert M. McBride & Co., New York:**
Island of Intrigue. By Isabel Ostrander. \$1.50; a Captive on a German Raider. By F. G. Traves. \$1.25; The Play-Work Book. By Ann Macbeth. With Fourteen Diagrams. \$1.00; Rimes in Olive Drab. By Sergeant John Pierre Roche. \$1.00.
- Marshall Jones Company, Boston:**
The Power of Dante. By Charles Hall Grandgent. \$2.00; The Truth About the Jameson Raid. By John Hays Hammond, As Related by Alleyne Ireland.
- G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York:**
Fragments from France. Part VI. By Captain Bruce Bairnsfather. \$0.50; The Texan, a Story of the Cattle Country. By James B. Hendryx. \$1.60; Motives in English Fiction. By Robert Naylor Whiteford, Ph.D. \$2.00; Eminent Victorians: Cardinal Manning—Florence Nightingale—Dr. Arnold—General Gordon. By Lytton Strachey. With Portraits. \$3.50; The Reckoning. By James M. Beck. \$1.50.
- Fleming H. Revell Co., New York:**
Foch, the Man. A Life of the Supreme Commander of the Allied Armies. By Clara E. Loughlin. With Illustrations. \$1.00.
- University of California Press, Berkeley:**
Francisco: Navarro Villoslada. By Beatrice Inijada Cornish. \$0.90; Studies in Spanish Dramatic Versification of the Siglo de Oro. Alarcón and Moreto. By S. Griswold Morley. \$0.50.
- Yale University Press, New Haven:**
Young Adventure. By Stephen Vincent Benét. \$1.25; The Effect of Diet on Endurance. By Irving Fisher, Ph.D. \$0.60.

EDUCATION

Educating the Child at Home

"If only I could give my children a good education," laments many a discouraged mother, "I would gladly work my fingers to the very bone. But there is no opportunity in this place, and we cannot afford to send them away from home."

Why look afar for what lies at our own threshold; nay, within the narrow boundary of our own home? Home life is the greatest educational agency in the world, for good, if the home is good; for bad, if the home is bad. In it, all physical, all mental, all moral qualities take root and grow. If the soil is good, and if the young plants are tenderly and carefully nurtured by the mother, the harvest, with God's help, will be good; but only with God's help. The home is the true garden where children should grow up. Not one helpful feature in the kindergarten as planned by Froebel, nor one helpful feature in the kindergarten as introduced into our public-school system, nor one helpful feature in the primary school, that is not ready at hand in every simple, well-ordered home.

THE TRUE EDUCATORS

EDUCATION is not book-knowledge. Boys and girls of fourteen so trained that they work intelligently, obey willingly, are reverent, courteous, prompt, self-controlled and observing, are educated, even if unable to pass a sixth-grade examination. On the other hand, the university graduate who lacks one or more of these essentials is not educated. It is neither possible nor desirable that all become Senators, but it is highly desirable and possible to educate every normal child into a good, upright, trustworthy, God-fearing citizen. To attain this will be worth any trouble, any anxious care, it may cause. It will be attained as soon as parents realize that they are the true and God-appointed educators and follow the maxim, "Train up a child in the way he should go."

The home, and the home only, can successfully educate. The school, at its best, can only build, according to its lights, upon the foundation given by home instruction, supplementing and developing the teaching given by wise parents. The school does not, cannot remodel the child that has made a false start at home. Men and women are what they are, because the home trained them aright, or failed to train them aright. The teacher-mother has been, is, and will ever be the greatest educational asset of mankind. Every mother who does not have to work to support her children, should herself teach them until they are prepared to enter, say, the third grade in our grammar schools and can, with credit to the mothers and themselves, take their places in these schools.

RESULTS OF HOME-TEACHING

NOW as to the results of such home teaching. It relieves the congestion in the lower grades, just where mass-teaching is most destructive; it prepares the children so that they will advance safely in school because they have learned how to work, and because they understand what they have learned.

It is far more important that the child when entering any school should be well trained, than that the new teacher should be competent. Even a poor teacher can teach something to one who has been trained to learn, and therefore wants to learn; the best teacher cannot teach one who has not been trained to learn and therefore does not want to learn. Natural ability, ambition, eagerness to excel will not bring success to the pupil untrained at home. No greater injustice can be done the child than to place it in school before it has learned *how to learn*, to obey, to observe, to attend, to measure, to answer questions, to memorize, to read, understand and correctly form simple sentences. These are the foundations for all ideal, real and practical education.

But are the mothers qualified to give such instruction? No mother who can read, is justified in saying that she does not know how to teach her own children. She can learn how, even

though she has had only primary schooling herself. At work in her home school, she becomes clever as she never was clever before. She learns by teaching. Her instinct, her patient and understanding love, as she watches her children's growth and development, guide her to find the right way to take her all-important part in their education. She does not need a rigid system. She does not need much theory. She is not dealing with theoretical children, but with children as they are.

A TEST FOR THE MOTHER-TEACHER

HERE is a test of the mother's ability to conduct her own kindergarten and primary school:

- Can you teach your children the Lord's Prayer?
- Can you teach them to sew on buttons? To tie a knot? To set the table? To use a broom? To draw a straight line?
- Can you teach them the names of the birds that visit your yard? The trees and flowers growing near your home? The common garden vegetables? The six primary colors?
- Can you teach them Mother Goose rhymes? The printed capital letters?
- Can you teach them to answer the question you ask, and not a question that you did not ask? Can you make them think before answering? Can you, and this is not so easy, can you make them see things as they are and describe exactly what they see?

If you can do these things, or can learn to do these things, you can also learn to do the other things that will be required of the teacher-mother. The mother need not sacrifice long hours to give book-instruction to her children. As one mother writes: "I have been teaching my children at home, but it has taken me such a little while each day to do what the teachers spend all day in doing, that I was afraid there was something wrong with my teaching." There is no need to spend money for costly devices, patented apparatus and multifarious books. The very best teaching a little child can have is that given by the mother who does her own housework. The very best lessons are those dealing with home surroundings, the child's world, which may seem commonplace to us, but in the eyes of that child are new and wonderful.

THE IMPORTANT PERIOD

LET us take a lesson from the lives of many men and women to whom our country owes its greatness. Their schooling was measured in months, not decades. Their own parents were their teachers. Their instruction was individual. The lessons and material were such as every well-ordered home in this land can afford. The cost in time and trouble was something, but the returns were worth it. Children thus taught learned much, but the parents have learned still more. The period between the ages of three and seven is the most important of the entire school course. At this period, individual instruction is advisable. As no two children are beginners at the same age in exactly the same sense, you cannot teach two young children successfully in exactly the same way. The teacher must follow the lead of the child, teaching him what he is ready to learn as it is shown by his questions. On such questions all child-psychology must be founded.

We may apply to education terms of forestry. The good forester has an eye to the direction and shape which the young tree should take. He uses prop and pruning-knife where needed. He trusts much to soil and rain and sunshine. He bears in mind that sturdy growth demands time and room to grow. He does not try to grow oaks in flower-pots. So the parents must have definite ideas as to the aims in education and then work constantly and methodically towards that end. They must educate the child for himself and for others, thus working out the good of the present as well as building up the future.

MAKE A PRACTICAL TEST

A LEAGUE of Teacher-Mothers has been founded by Miss Ella Frances Lynch, and its members receive from her guidance and instruction. The method followed is the old method that has stood the test of time since the days of Plato. Within

a year, over 5,000 mothers have enrolled their children in this old-fashioned school, each mother pledging herself to give systematic daily instruction to her children between the ages of three and seven. To each mother who answers the following questions and encloses nine cents postage, Miss Lynch, who may be addressed at Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania, will write individually and as helpfully as circumstances permit.

- (1) Child's name. (2) Date of birth. (3) Home (farm, village, city). (4) Name some of the trees and flowers growing in your vicinity. (5) Does the child have a little garden, a window-box or house-plants? (6) Is either of the parents free to spend a little time daily with the child? (7) What tools does the child use? (8) What help does he give his parents daily? (9) Give list of tasks you think suitable for his strength and understanding, from which we might choose. (10) Can the child knit? Sew? (11) What is his favorite toy? Game? Pet? (12) What good habits is he forming? (13) What bad habits? (14) What prayers, songs, hymns, poems, or Bible verses has he learned by heart? (15) Name books (poetry and prose) that you have. (16) Does the child know the printed capital letters? (17) Can he spell any words? How many? (18) How do you punish him? Is it effective?

Teaching in the home is becoming increasingly important, and Catholic mothers will do well to inquire what aid may be afforded by Miss Lynch's carefully arranged plans.

JOHN STEVENSON.

ECONOMICS

Foreign Trade

THE people have been educated to measure the prosperity of a country by the amount of its foreign trade, and some of us are now being forcibly fed with that theory, through the press of the country. It is the common opinion that goods shipped abroad represent the amount of surplus products that, in order to be sold, must be disposed of in another market. This conclusion is in great part true, but it is a false notion that it is well to seek opportunity to ship abroad. If a community produced but one commodity, for instance wheat, certainly there would be a great quantity available for export. But if oats were also produced, the total goods possible to export would be lessened. The more diversified the industries of a community, the less "surplus" there must be. But no one would say that a community was poor because its industries represented the greatest diversity, thus having but a minimum quantity of goods for export. So, it is not true that a people's prosperity may be measured by the amount of its foreign trade; rather is prosperity realized through the lessening of foreign trade.

THE DETERMINANTS OF PROSPERITY

AS the consumer is the final determiner of the value of a commodity, the price we have to pay for goods from other countries is not controlled by the cost of production abroad, but by the efficiency, or inefficiency, of domestic producers of similar goods. So, the greater the general efficiency of a people, the less price they have to pay for the goods that they consume, and efficiency can be acquired only through the act of producing.

That consideration may be given this proposition, it is necessary to present some recognized authority in support of it. Professor F. W. Taussig, dean of American economists, and Chairman of the Tariff Board, is called upon for confirmation of this theory. He says, in "Some Aspects of the Tariff Question":

It is conceivable that improvements and inventions will be so completely adopted by all the advanced countries as to bring about an equalization in their industrial conditions; which of necessity would lessen the volume and the importance of trade between them.

The general adoption of improvements and inventions tends, then, not to an increase in foreign trade, but to the opposite. Yet, improvements and inventions must tend to the advancement of people, in their arts and in their well-being. It is doubtful,

though, judging from his seeming predilection to foreign trade, that Professor Taussig would encourage the consummation that not only "advanced" countries attain the condition of being self-sustaining, but that people of all parts of the world acquire efficiency in producing their necessities, and even their luxuries. When such general efficiency prevails, as our eminent authority says:

No one country will then possess advantages in manufactures over others; no one will be able to export to another; trade between them in manufactured goods—if the assumed conditions hold absolutely—will cease.

Although cessation of trade would under those circumstances be the greatest boon to mankind, since wars would not be, for want of any material thing to fight for, yet the ideal will have no encouragement from capitalists. For their profit is obtained, not through the efficiency of the people, or of the capitalists themselves, but through the comparative inefficiency of the peoples of the earth. In the capitalists' ideal, efficiency is measured by inefficiency, by the profit available in doing business with the inefficient. Those engaged in foreign trade would make special effort to maintain the condition under which a community produced the least number of its necessities. They would stifle general efficiency. With them, the perfect society is that body of men who can do but one thing well, and do that cheaply.

IN THE RECONSTRUCTION PERIOD

HENCE the authority previously quoted is safe in his prophecy, regarding self-sustaining nations, that "this consummation will not be reached for an indefinite period; nay, probably it will never be reached." Not only is the effect of segregating special industries harmful in regard to the nations of the world, but great injury is also done within our own country by such concentration in various communities. Thus, Cardinal O'Connell when recently visiting Lowell, his boyhood home, expressed surprise at the condition of the people, who had produced such vast quantities of wealth that was not within their reach and was of no benefit to them. That wealth must have been invested, if not in foreign lands, in remote regions of the United States. Perhaps it did afford capital to build up our West. But the workers who consumed the product, before they were permitted to partake of it had to produce at least an equal amount of value. They might as well have produced the kind of goods they consumed as the values they produced. In fact, the goods from Lowell not only did not specially benefit the Western workers, but lessened their opportunities for employment. True, the West would not have had such mushroom growth, in capital and population; but the fact remains that it was built up, in large part, at the expense of the industrial communities of the East.

In the coming reconstruction period, America will be called upon for help, and she will give it, no doubt, in abundance. But let it be by way of gift. The cost to our people will be much less if we contribute, rather than lend. Lending represents a present cost to the workers, anyway, and the future payment by Europe would endanger their steady employment. By lending, capital would make its profit on the goods shipped, and would own the goods. The present cost to the workers is not the amount that the Government raises by taxation; the present cost to the workers is represented by the entire expenditure of the Government, whether in the form of domestic expenditure or repayable foreign loans. Also, it is of questionable benefit to the European people for us either to lend or give them our commodities, except for their immediate relief. Europe's productive workers will not receive any of our goods gratis; they will have to produce value for value. Their disbanding armies will be the better assimilated into industries, the greater the reconstruction work left for them to do. But the more we lend Europe, the greater the profit to our financiers; so we will probably lend, and not give.

FOREIGN TRADE AND INDUSTRIAL UNREST

FOREIGN trade is entirely responsible for the unrest among the workers. Interest on mere capital is the product of foreign trade. When the Church held interest to be usury, before the nations of Europe started their world colonization program, even in England money capital was charged storage. Capital, represented by the supplying of their immediate necessities, was of great value to the colonists. They had to pay interest; and then the Europeans had to do likewise, in order to retain capital at home.

The great point in what is called Socialism is that mere capital is not entitled to profit, though the management of an industry be entitled to its earnings. Capital could not secure profit if it were kept in the community in which it was produced. In fact, for preserving for a term of years the original value of capital, its owner should be under obligation to society.

If capital had no interest-earning power, it would not mean poverty, but prosperity. It would only lose its earning power by reason of its abundance, because of the ease with which capital could be accumulated. The greater the wealth of a community, the less its comparative value. Great value, great price, is attributable to scarcity, difficulty of attainment; not to plentifulness. Manna would be the greatest wealth, but it would have no value. But, Frank A. Vanderlip, our premier financier, is reported to have said, "America is a nation of economic illiterates." It is not recorded that in the same breath he offered thanks, for himself and his fellows.

M. P. CONNERY.

NOTE AND COMMENT

A Carsonite View of the President

THE High Sheriff of Dublin recently entertained Lord French to dinner, in the ancient capital of Ireland. Among the guests was an interesting relic of old prejudices in the person of Professor Mahaffy. Of course he spoke, he always does so, and this is what he said:

I should advise President Wilson that, even if he is infallible, he had better not use his infallibility too freely, but imitate the Pope, the only infallible person in the world, by not using it at all.

In these days of international comity, it would be quite too bad to criticize this solemn Orangeman too severely, but perhaps it is permissible to say that probably Professor Mahaffy is really angry with the President for snatching Ulster from the "great Protestant prince," the ex-Kaiser. The Professor and his fellows, men without a country, may be still smarting under the failure of their attempt to hand Ireland over to the Count who is now languishing in Holland.

For the Freedom of the World

NOT since the crusades have so many people of all ranks had such an opportunity of taking part in a world-wide movement as the war offered them with its call to duty and sacrifice, whether on the field or in the home. The motto, "Give till it hurts" became a fact in the lives of all. Nowhere, perhaps, was this spirit displayed more than in the almost universal purchasing of Liberty bonds. Our generosity was unbounded, and particularly was this true of Catholics. But now comes a letter telling us that from more than one quarter missionaries are hearing the ominous warning: "Do not expect any help from Americans. The war loans have drained their purses." On which the writer observes: "Perhaps, but not their hearts," and he forthwith proceeds to show how more than ever we can and should be of help to our missions, which now actually stand in the most urgent need of our generosity:

Well, here is a way; a way to help your country, to add to her prestige, to make her known in pagan lands as the home of generous and far-sighted Catholics, and at the same time

to give to some poor struggling mission or missionary a substantial aid reaching far enough into the future to tide over the lean years that are even now beginning. Give a Liberty Bond to some needy mission; a big bond if you can afford it; a little one if you can afford that; Thrift Stamps, if you can afford neither. It is turning a loan to the Government into a loan to the Lord; for "he that giveth to the poor lendeth to the Lord." You'll never be more "in the giving mood" than you are now. It will cost indeed; but sacrifices that cost nothing are not worth much in merit to the donor, however much they may be to the beneficiary. The Liberty Loan campaigns have taught you to look to the future for returns. Patriotism has raised you out of the rut of self-interest. The mere name of liberty has stirred your soul like a trumpet. *Sursum corda.* Enlarge your prospect to see and aid them that are in the ancient bondage so that, thanks to you, they may "know the truth and the truth shall set them free."

We do not see how any Catholic can refuse to heed this ardent pleading to give according to his means to this supreme cause of liberty: the freedom of the world from the shackles of error, ignorance and sin, and the bestowal upon all mankind of the liberty of the children of God, wherewith we have been Divinely favored. It is the least act of gratitude and appreciation we can show for the Faith that God has given us.

Lutheran Zeal for the United Campaign

THE zeal with which some Lutherans exerted themselves in behalf of the "United War Work Campaign" is illustrated by this abstract from the *Bulletin* of St. Paul's Evangelical Lutheran Church, the Bronx, of which the Rev. Karl Kretzmann is pastor, and the Rev. Julius C. Kretzmann, assistant pastor:

In a few weeks "The United War Work Campaign" will strike our city. We are very sorry that the Y. M. C. A. and other Protestant war work agencies have seen fit to tie up with the Roman Catholic Knights of Columbus. While we should help the Y. M. C. A., the War Camp Community Service, etc., we cannot with good conscience support Roman Catholic religious war work. We know whereof we speak when we say religious work. The best thing for us to do when the solicitors call on us for money—a large part of which will go into the pockets of Rome—is to tell them very politely that we have already given generously to our own Lutheran welfare work in army and navy, and that we would be glad to contribute to the social and recreational work of the Y. M. C. A., etc., at a time when there would be no danger of the money going into the pockets of Rome. Let no one say that you are not patriotic because you do not care to give to the Roman Catholic Church. We have shown our patriotism in many ways, and stand ready to do so again. Neither God nor the Government expect us to give up our religious convictions. Here's where we draw the line.

Can it be that the Bronx has not seen the testimony of Protestant, Jew and Catholic soldiers that the Y. M. C. A. specializes in "sandwiching" religion with "social or recreational work," whereas the K. C. never obtrudes religion on the soldier? Be that as it may, one would think that Lutherans above all would have been willing to help the campaign, if for no other reason than to make amends for the grossest brutality in the history of the world, the brutality of Lutheran Prussia.

Peace Program of American Organized Labor

TWO sets of resolutions, defining the labor peace plan, were introduced by Mr. Gompers at the recent Pan-American Labor Conference held at Laredo, Texas, which was attended by delegates from Mexico and the South and Central American countries. Five "essential fundamental principles," he said, must underlie the future peace of all civilized peoples:

A league of the free peoples of the world in a common covenant for genuine and practical cooperation to secure justice and, therefore, peace in relations between nations. No political or economic restrictions meant simply to benefit some nations and to cripple or embarrass others. No reprisals based on vindictive purpose, or deliberate desire to injure, but to right manifest wrongs. Recognition of rights

of small nations and of the principle that no people must be forced under a sovereignty under which it does not wish to live. No territorial changes or adjustments of powers except in furtherance of the welfare of the people affected, and in furtherance of world peace.

In addition to these "basic principles," he demanded that there should be incorporated in the treaty which is to guide the nations in the new period, the following seven supplementary declarations, "fundamental to the best interests of all nations and of vital importance to wage-earners":

That in law and in practice the principle shall be recognized that the labor of human beings is not a commodity or article of commerce. Industrial servitude shall not exist except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted. The right of free association, free assemblage, free speech and free press shall not be abridged. That the seamen of the merchant marine shall be guaranteed the right of leaving their vessels when the same are safe in harbor. No article or commodity shall be shipped or delivered in international commerce in the production of which children under the age of sixteen years have been employed or permitted to work. It shall be declared that the basic work day in industry and commerce shall not exceed eight hours a day. Trial by jury should be established.

These resolutions, he declared, embodied the program which organized labor in America wishes to be embraced in the international peace treaty. Speaking as president of the American Federation of Labor, Mr. Gompers doubtless represented correctly the sentiments of the organization which numbers over 2,000,000 members.

Better Than the Gold of Ophir; a Little Child

THE Health Commissioner of New York City recently announced that 400 fatherless and motherless children had been left adrift by the influenza epidemic. In view of the already overcrowded conditions of the institutions, he was seeking for "ready-made families" to take these orphans into their homes. We need not look for an epidemic, says Prudence Bradish in the *Evening Post*: "There is always right at hand for you, if you will turn your eyes that way, some little chap, some little girl, whose lonely little heart aches for the love that every normal child ought to have." Why then should there be childless hearts and hearths while there are so many little ones hungering for love. "Is it that you are willing to give everything but yourself?" she asks.

A home without children in it is a barren place at best. A good dog has a large heart. I love dogs. But the best dog that ever wagged a tail cannot fill the lonesome place in the heart of the childless woman; no welcome that Fido can give the man when he comes home at night can really substitute for the clinging hands of the little tad that has been waiting for Father. If you have that kind of a heart, why are you trying to satisfy yourself with even the best of dogs—or with nothing at all?

You who have never had a child, you cannot imagine the joy of possessing a little being to love and cherish. You whose hearts ache over the vacancy by your fire that death has made—there is a child waiting for you, and no work is too great, no task too small to perform for this bit of humanity that you can bring into the light and love of the real home that he will help you make.

This last appeal in particular may come home with telling force to many a household at the present moment, even though it may not have been left entirely childless. Why idly mourn when there are little ones yearning to be mothered? To the heart that hungers for the sound of little voices and the patter of little feet, and yet hesitates to take the necessary step, the writer suggests the experiment of borrowing an orphaned child for just a month. "I warrant that in the average case, by the time the thirty days were up, that little one would have a clutch upon your heart-strings that you wouldn't break for all the gold of Ophir." Besides Christ tells us that in receiving such a little one, in His name, we in truth receive Him.